



**Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive**

---

Theses and Dissertations

Thesis Collection

---

1979

Officer promotion opportunity within the Navy  
unrestricted line 1973-1979.

Hansell, Ross C.

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School

---

<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/18814>



Calhoun is a project of the Dudley Knox Library at NPS, furthering the precepts and goals of open government and government transparency. All information contained herein has been approved for release by the NPS Public Affairs Officer.

**Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School**  
**411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle**  
**Monterey, California USA 93943**

<http://www.nps.edu/library>









# NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

## Monterey, California



# THESIS

OFFICER PROMOTION OPPORTUNITY WITHIN  
THE NAVY UNRESTRICTED LINE 1973-1979

by

Ross C. Hansell

June 1979

Thesis Advisor:

R.S. Elster

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

T 189135



| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                       | READ INSTRUCTIONS<br>BEFORE COMPLETING FORM                         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. REPORT NUMBER                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER                                       |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitle)<br>Officer Promotion Opportunity Within<br>The Navy Unrestricted Line 1973-1979                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                       | 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED<br>Master's Thesis;<br>June 1979 |
| 7. AUTHOR(s)<br>Ross C. Hansell                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                       | 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER                                    |
| 9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93940                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                       | 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)                                      |
| 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93940                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                       | 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK<br>AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS      |
| 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93940                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                       | 12. REPORT DATE                                                     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                       | 13. NUMBER OF PAGES<br>91                                           |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                       | 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)<br>Unclass                     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                       | 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING<br>SCHEDULE                       |
| 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)<br>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                       |                                                                     |
| 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                       |                                                                     |
| 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                       |                                                                     |
| 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)<br>promotion<br>officer promotion                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                       |                                                                     |
| 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)<br>The U.S. Navy's unrestricted line (URL) officer promotion process serves as a reward system for individual officers and largely determines the officer manpower flows and grade structure within the URL.<br>This thesis briefly examines the historical roots and defines the mechanics of the modern promotion system. It reports the results of a promotion attitude survey administered to 128 line |                       |                                                                     |





officers at the Naval Postgraduate School. The survey addressed numerous issues regarding promotion equity and compares perceptions regarding selection opportunity between major URL communities: aviation, surface, submarine and women officers. Most importantly, these perceptions are then compared to actual promotion success data gathered from Fiscal Years 1973-1979 for the grades of Lieutenant Commander to Captain.

The paper identifies several areas of concern to officers, but concludes that the promotion system has functioned well in an overall sense.



OFFICER PROMOTION OPPORTUNITY WITHIN  
THE NAVY UNRESTRICTED LINE 1973-1979

by

Ross C. Hansell  
Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy  
B.S., Florida Atlantic University, 1968

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

June 1979



## ABSTRACT

The U.S. Navy's unrestricted line (URL) officer promotion process serves as a reward system for individual officers and largely determines the officer manpower flows and grade structure within the URL.

This thesis briefly examines the historical roots and defines the mechanics of the modern promotion system. It reports the results of a promotion attitude survey administered to 128 line officers at the Naval Postgraduate School. The survey addressed numerous issues regarding promotion equity and compares perceptions regarding selection opportunity between major URL communities: aviation, surface, submarine and women officers. Most importantly, these perceptions are then compared to actual promotion success data gathered from Fiscal Years 1973-1979 for the grades of Lieutenant Commander to Captain.

The paper identifies several areas of concern to officers, but concludes that the promotion system has functioned well in an overall sense.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                            | Page |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION -----                                                      | 9    |
| II. PROMOTION SYSTEM BACKGROUND -----                                      | 12   |
| A. HISTORY -----                                                           | 12   |
| B. DOPMA -----                                                             | 13   |
| III. THE PROMOTION PROCESS -----                                           | 18   |
| A. PROMOTION OPPORTUNITY -----                                             | 18   |
| B. GRADE STRUCTURE AND THE PROMOTION PLAN -----                            | 20   |
| C. SELECTION BOARDS -----                                                  | 23   |
| D. OTHER PROMOTION PROCESSES -----                                         | 25   |
| IV. LINE OFFICER ATTITUDE SURVEY -----                                     | 27   |
| A. SURVEY METHODOLOGY -----                                                | 27   |
| B. OFFICER SURVEY RESULTS -----                                            | 29   |
| V. HISTORICAL PROMOTION DATA -----                                         | 56   |
| A. DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY -----                                      | 56   |
| B. DATA PRESENTATION -----                                                 | 57   |
| C. DATA ANALYSIS CONCLUSIONS -----                                         | 61   |
| VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS -----                                          | 64   |
| A. SUMMARY -----                                                           | 64   |
| B. CONCLUSIONS -----                                                       | 64   |
| VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH -----                         | 69   |
| APPENDIX A OFFICER PROMOTION QUESTIONNAIRE -----                           | 71   |
| APPENDIX B COMMISSIONED OFFICERS PROMOTION<br>OPPORTUNITY AND TIMING ----- | 76   |





## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

|                                                                                                        | Page |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| APPENDIX C MALE AND FEMALE OFFICER SELECTION RATES -----                                               | 78   |
| APPENDIX D URL PROMOTION SELECTION RESULTS BY OFFICER<br>DESIGNATOR (FY 1973 to 1979, LCDR to CAPT)--- | 79   |
| APPENDIX E PROMOTION P MEASURES BY OFFICER DESIGNATOR---                                               | 86   |
| REFERENCES AND SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY -----                                                             | 88   |
| INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST -----                                                                        | 90   |



## LIST OF TABLES

|        |                                                                          |    |
|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I.     | POPULATION OF SURVEY REpondENTS -----                                    | 28 |
| II.    | OFFICER UNDERSTANDING OF PROMOTION SYSTEM -----                          | 30 |
| III.   | OFFICER SATISFACTION WITH PROMOTION SYSTEM -----                         | 31 |
| IV.    | PROMOTION OPPORTUNITY INFLUENCE ON<br>CAREER DECISION -----              | 34 |
| V.     | ASPECTS OF PROMOTION INFLUENCE -----                                     | 36 |
| VI.    | IMPORTANCE OF LAST PROMOTION -----                                       | 38 |
| VII.   | FACTORS OF INDIVIDUAL OFFICER PROMOTION -----                            | 40 |
| VIII.  | CIVILIAN VS. MILITARY OPPORTUNITY -----                                  | 41 |
| IX.    | COMPARISON OF PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES<br>FOR THE MILITARY SERVICES ----- | 43 |
| X.     | INTENDED RETIREMENT POINT -----                                          | 46 |
| XI.    | URL DESIGNATOR PROMOTION OPPORTUNITY -----                               | 47 |
| XII.   | PROMOTION AS A TOOL TO ADJUST<br>RETENTION RATES -----                   | 49 |
| XIII.  | "NEEDS OF THE NAVY" VS.<br>"BEST FITTED CRITERION" -----                 | 50 |
| XIV.   | ATTITUDES REGARDING PROMOTION RATE<br>AND TIMING FOR WOMEN -----         | 51 |
| XV.    | ATTITUDES REGARDING THE INTEGRATION<br>OF PROMOTION BOARDS -----         | 52 |
| XVI.   | ATTITUDES REGARDING THE GUARANTEE<br>OF PROMOTION RATES FOR WOMEN -----  | 53 |
| XVII.  | ATTITUDES REGARDING THE UP OR OUT POLICY -----                           | 55 |
| XVIII. | LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINE FRACTION<br>1973-1979 -----                    | 58 |
| IXX.   | COMMANDER LINE FRACTION 1973-1979 -----                                  | 59 |
| XX.    | CAPTAIN LINE FRACTION 1973-1979 -----                                    | 59 |



LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

|       |                                                                     |    |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| XXI.  | AGGREGATE LINE FRACTION 1973-1979 -----                             | 60 |
| XXII. | OFFICER PERCEPTIONS VS. ACTUAL<br>PROMOTION HISTORY 1973-1979 ----- | 67 |



## I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

This is a thesis concerning promotion opportunity for U.S. Navy unrestricted line (URL) officers. At the present, Navy line officers of the same paygrade but of varied backgrounds and warfare skills are considered as a single group for promotion purposes. Promotion selection boards are tasked with the job of choosing only the "best-fitted" officers for promotion to the next higher pay grade. These selection decisions are not made with regard for manpower requirements within specific URL subgroups or communities. Selection requirements are placed only on the URL as a whole. This thesis investigates the promotion rates of the major URL designator classifications to the grades of Lieutenant Commander, Commander and Captain during Fiscal Years 1973 through 1979.

To be effective, a promotion system must serve both the organization and the individual. The promotion system is to a large extent responsible for determining force structure and ensuring that adequate numbers of officers of the desired grades are available to fill vacated positions throughout the organization. An efficient promotion system is even more crucial to a closed personnel system like the U.S. military that permits few lateral personnel transfers from outside organizations. Equally important, the system must serve to reward the experienced, high performing officers that are capable of assuming added responsibility and authority.





Similarly, adequate promotion opportunities must exist to serve as incentives for future individual performance and professional growth. Like any other incentive system, the promotion process should be perceived as fair and equitable to all members of the organization, otherwise individual morale, group unity and officer retention will suffer in the long run.

This thesis has been organized into three main parts. First, the reader is provided with a brief overview of the evolution of the present promotion system and with an awareness for the major mechanisms and functional features of the URL officer promotion process. Included is a succinct description of the provisions of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) which, if implemented, would significantly alter the current promotion system. Secondly, an analysis of the results of an attitude survey administered to 128 Navy URL officers is presented. This survey measured individual and group perceptions of promotion system opportunity and equity including officer opinions regarding women's equality, promotion incentives, overall satisfaction, and proposed changes to the system. Finally, the data for seven years of actual URL promotion board selections are presented and comparisons of promotion success are offered for the review of the reader. Conclusions of overall promotion system performance are made and recommendations for future research are extended.

The Navy's officer promotion system has proven to be dynamic in nature with numerous changes made since World War II.



Since 1973, the system has operated coincident to the emergence of an all-volunteer military. The purpose of this thesis is to assess the performance of the officer promotion system with respect to the individual during this All-Volunteer Force (AVF) period in terms of perceived fairness and demonstrated equity within the Navy Unrestricted Line Officer Corps.



## II. PROMOTION SYSTEM BACKGROUND

### A. HISTORY

The present armed forces officer promotion system was designed to eliminate system maladies discovered during World War II. During the war, it was necessary to remove significant numbers of senior officers from the ranks due to advanced age and ill health. In addition, many younger officers were rapidly promoted to senior grades (many out of necessity) without the opportunity to gain experience in the middle grades. Because of these problems, officer personnel management legislation was introduced shortly after the end of the war.

In the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, Congress sought to establish a comprehensive officer personnel management system which would incorporate the lessons learned before and during World War II. This law provides much of the foundation for today's officer personnel system. The system provides that officers are considered for promotion at various points in their careers and if passed over for promotion two or more times are, after a certain number of years of service depending upon the particular grade, removed from active service or, if eligible, retired. This is commonly referred to as the up-or-out-system.

*Not a  
Navy officer*

*St.  
Can. mem.  
Keep a  
show me  
2*

In 1954 the Congress became concerned with the increased number of senior officers in the Armed Forces and the increased use of temporary promotions. In order to better control the



grade distribution, Congress passed the Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954. This law established limitations on the number of both Regular and Reserve officers who may serve on active duty in O-4 and above. [Ref. 1 p. 11]

The Officer Personnel Act of 1947 provided a much more effective management system than had existed in the past, but it had several shortcomings. These were related to the fact that the Act was based on forecasted developments that never took place. Specifically, the lawmakers assumed the military services would return to a small, all regular force within ten years after the war. The Act imposed statutory ceilings on the number of regular officers in each service and also allowed the continuation of significant personnel differences between the armed services. In addition, the Air Force, being the most junior service, began experiencing problems with the restrictive personnel ceilings encountered under the Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954 and temporary relief legislation was necessary in 1966, 1968, 1972 and 1974. [Ref. 1 p. 10]

#### B. DOPMA

Probably the next step in this evolutionary process will be the implementation of the provisions of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) which would significantly revise the laws which govern the management of the entire (DOD-wide) commissioned officer force. The following [Ref. 1 pp. 6-7] is a brief summary of the features of the bill:

Grade reductions. The bill provides for new permanent grade limitations for each of the services for the grades O-4, O-5





and 0-6; that is, major, lieutenant colonel and colonel (in the Navy, lieutenant commander, commander and captain). The bill as originally submitted by the Department of Defense called for a level of grade authorizations generally below those presently contained in law.

Single-promotion system. The bill provides for a single permanent promotion structure for each of the services, replacing the dual temporary and permanent promotion systems presently used in the Army and Air Force and eliminating the complex running-mate system presently in use in the Navy.

All-Regular force. The bill provides that after 11 years of commissioned service all career-force active-duty officers would become Regular officers. Reserve officers would be augmented into the Regular force or removed from active duty by the 11-year point.

Selective continuation. The bill establishes standardized career patterns of 30 years for colonel or Navy captain; 26 years for lieutenant colonel or Navy commander; and 20 years for major or Navy lieutenant commander. The bill provides for selective-continuation procedures for these grades. These include a one-time review by a continuation board for colonels and Navy captains after four years in grade and lieutenant colonels and commanders after twice failing of selection for promotion, with the requirement that at least 70 percent be retained until the normal retirement point. In the case of majors and lieutenant commanders the bill structures the grade table to allow a 70-percent selection opportunity to lieutenant colonel and commander and provides for continuation



boards so that twice-passed-over officers can be considered for continuation until 20 years.

Commodore admiral. The bill requires a positive selection from the grade of 0-7 to 0-8 in the Navy and creates the new title of commodore admiral for the Navy 0-7 grade. It gives the Navy a one-star rank comparable to brigadier general in the other services in place of the present system of promotion from captain to two-star rank and insignia and automatic advancement from 0-7 to 0-8 pay grade.

Constructive credit. The bill provides new procedures for application of what is known as "constructive service credit", used to determine initial entry grade, seniority and promotion eligibility, to officers with advanced education beyond the baccalaureate level when the advanced training is a prerequisite for appointment as a commissioned officer. The bill makes special provisions for determining the constructive credit for health professions where the normal educational experience exceeds the stated requirement of the educational institutions concerned.

Exclusions. The bill provides for uniform exclusions from the limitations of the grade tables for all services. Those excluded would be Selective Service officers; physicians and dentists; warrant officers; retired officers recalled to active duty; general and flag officers; and Reserve officers on active duty for training, for Reserve administration or special work, or on recall to active duty in a national emergency declared after January 1, 1975. In the latter case the exclusions would be for the duration of the emergency plus



six months.

Separation pay. The bill provides for the payment of separation pay equal to 10 percent of annual basic pay times years of service up to a maximum of \$30,000 for commissioned officers involuntarily separated prior to qualifying for retirement.

This bill also provides for the "equalization of treatment" of female officers in regards to appointment, promotion, accountability and mandatory retirement. This bill does not; however, seek to override the laws (United States Code Title 10 Sections 6015 and 8549) which exclude women from certain aircraft and ships identified as having a combat mission. The bill otherwise removes "all differences" of treatment based on sex. With respect to promotion, the bill would require women officers to compete under the same selection boards as their male counterparts. Also, the proposal would eliminate all references in the law toward female officers on selection boards. Also, present law in the Navy and Marine Corps limits women to spot promotions of flag rank. In other words, a female officer can be promoted to flag only if she is selected for a billet that demands such a rank. Technically, she would revert back to the rank of Captain if she were ordered back to a job not identified with flag rank. DOPMA would eliminate this provision. Henceforth, they would be promoted to all grades in the same way as male officers.

DOPMA is presently before Congress. Similar legislation has been presented to Congress three times since 1973, but in



each case it has failed Senate ratification, primarily because of a lack of integration with other military personnel legislation proposals(e.g. pay and retirement) that are not directly addressed by DOPMA.





### III. THE PROMOTION PROCESS

The current Navy officer promotion system is based on law and on policy control vested in the Secretary of the Navy. The system is designed to meet the needs of the Navy, provide equitable promotion opportunities for individual officers and meet force structure restrictions set by Congress. The promotion process, best described as a cycle, consists of three main elements: eligibility, selection and promotion. Each element is controlled by law (United States Code, Title 10), or by the Navy Secretary, who approves the overall officer promotion plan on an annual basis.

#### A. PROMOTION OPPORTUNITY

Promotion opportunity is commonly referred to as a selection percentage; however, the full meaning requires a more elaborate description. Promotion opportunity is the product of three interacting factors: (1) the prescribed number, which is the total number of officers in certain Navy categories which shall be maintained in each grade or combination of grades, (2) the promotion flow point, which is the number of years of commissioned service experienced before promotion to a higher rank, and (3) the promotion percentage, which is the percentage of officers authorized to be selected divided by the number of officers in the promotion zone. These factors are interrelated and cannot be divorced from one another.



The prescribed number is established by the Secretary of the Navy at least once per year and it defines the total number of unrestricted line officers and line limited duty officers. From these prescribed numbers, the numbers of expected vacancies can be calculated, and, based on this, the Secretary determines the number of officers to be promoted within the grade structure.

The second factor, promotion flow point, is the time-element factor and refers to the completed years of commissioned service. These flow points are variable. At present, officers in the promotion zone will have the following approximate years of commissioned service: [Ref. 2 p. 4]

| <u>GRADE</u> | <u>PROMOTION FLOW POINT</u> |
|--------------|-----------------------------|
| LTJG         | 2 years                     |
| LT           | 4 years                     |
| LCDR         | 9-10 years                  |
| CDR          | 15-16 years                 |
| CAPT         | 21-22 years                 |

The third promotion opportunity factor is the promotion percentage. Usually a percentage is set as a goal in the promotion plan and then zone size is determined. For example, if a promotion percentage of 70% is desired and 140 selections are authorized, then the zone will include 200 officers. The actual selection percentage, defined previously as the line fraction, is important to other officer communities besides the unrestricted line in that by law, the restricted line is guaranteed a selection rate not less than the line fraction.



## B. GRADE STRUCTURE AND THE PROMOTION PLAN

Officer grade structure is set by law which imposes constraints on the promotion system. Title Ten of the United States Code specifies:

- (1) the maximum allowable number of officers
- (2) the maximum number of officers in grades of Lieutenant Commander and above.
- (3) the minimum time in grade before an officer can become eligible for promotion
- (4) the maximum time in grade before an officer must be considered for promotion
- (5) that the Navy must maintain a lineal list of all officers so that eligibility for promotion will be solely a function of time in grade
- (6) the separation from service of any officer who twice fails to select for promotion
- (7) that no large adjustments may be made in manpower flow rates for any one year that would threaten to disrupt the equality of opportunity for officers becoming eligible over the next five years

The structure of the officer corps of the Navy, like that of any operating organization, civil or military, forms a pyramid which rises from its broad base of junior officers to a few flag officers at the top and to one Chief of Naval Operations. If there is to be a realistic flow of promotion up this pyramid, all who enter at the bottom cannot reach the top, but each officer has the same opportunity as his contemporaries to reach the top grades of his category. [Ref. 3 p.2]



The grade table consists of two structures. One structure is provided for permanent grades of Regular Navy officers and another for temporary grades for all active duty officers. Within the temporary grade structure the Secretary of the Navy each establishes a prescribed number for each year control grade for the promotion base. [Ref. 4 p. 3]

Thus, the nature of the grade table legally constrains the promotion process. In addition, the URL is limited to seven percent of the authorized strength of the Regular Navy in enlisted members. [Ref. 5 Section 5403] Similarly, the size of most staff and specialist officer communities is authorized as a percentage of the URL authorized strength. Nevertheless, promotion probability remains as a policy variable under the control of the Navy.

Each year the Secretary of the Navy reviews the officer grade structure and adjustments are made as necessary to the three promotion opportunity factors discussed previously. Decisions are made for each grade beginning with the Captain grade. By law, each rank supports or "feeds" the one above it, and changes in any of the three factors for a specific grade are closely studied for their effects on adjacent grades.

Annually, vacancies are estimated for each year group based on attrition data for every year of commissioned service. From this information, five year projects are made for the grades of Lieutenant Commander, Commander and Captain in the unrestricted line, since the number of selections to these grades depends upon the number of vacancies





estimated. Vacancy estimates are not required for the Lieutenant (junior grade) or Lieutenant grades. The vacancy projections for ranks above Lieutenant are calculated utilizing the Projected Officer Personnel Inventory model (POPI) which considers historical attrition rates by length of service (LOS) and by officer community. All feasible five-year projection options are studied for each grade in light of: (1) officer requirements, (2) the required grade and category billets compared to the predicted results of the promotion plans, (3) the size of the non-selected community in each grade, (4) the effect of the unequal size of succeeding year groups (to include the problems thereby created), and (5) the total effects of the three promotion opportunity factors in providing equal opportunity. Based on the foregoing, promotion plans for each grade are developed in accordance with the information contained in the five year projections.

Elements of a promotion plan for a grade and designator include the estimated vacancies, the planned number to select, the promotion percentage, the number in the zone, the senior and junior officers in the zone (in terms of time in grade), the junior officer eligible below zone, and the total number of officers eligible. The promotion zone in each grade is composed of the most senior officers under consideration who are eligible for selection for promotion to the next higher grade and who have not previously failed selection.

The exact number of selections authorized is made only within seventy-two hours prior to the expected completion of the promotion board's deliberations. This is based on the



approved promotion percentage applied to a count of officers that were actually in the zone on the day the board convened. [Ref. 6 p. 74]

### C. SELECTION BOARDS

It is the function of the selection board to recommend for promotion only those officers who have best demonstrated the potential for future service in the Navy. The board concentrates primarily on the selection zone; however, eligible officers above (senior to) and below the zone are also considered. The number of officers who may be selected from below the zone is set by law to be no more than five percent of total selections. [Ref. 5 Section 5701]

The selection boards consist of a small number of senior officers (Captains and above). Members take an oath that they will, without prejudice or partiality, select only the best of those officers under consideration for promotion.

The selection board reviews two primary microfiche sections of each officer's official record. The first section includes fitness reports, reports of awards, medals and citations, and the latest individual photograph. The second section describes the officer's professional history, including educational data, warfare qualifications, designator, appointments and so forth. A third microfiche section, termed "privileged information" is prepared on individual officers only if there is correspondence which is derogatory in nature resulting from official courts and proceedings, including medical boards, which becomes a matter of official record. [Ref. 2 pp. 15-16]



The "URL Career Guidebook" states that "the board proceeds to evaluate each officer's record, considering the breadth of professional background, the responsibilities carried and the fitness report marks received for the performance of varied duties. The board then recommends those 'best-fitted' for promotion in numbers not to exceed the authorized number to select".

All proceedings are confidential and are confined to the board room. Each member's votes are secret and the board is not required to submit the reasons for its decisions. The selection board presents the list of selectees in order of seniority. Deliberations normally endure for two to three weeks for Captain boards and three to four weeks for Commander and Lieutenant Commander boards.

The crux of understanding the selection board's problem is the meaning of the term "best fitted", as distinguished from "qualified". The Navy's standards for the original commissioning of an officer seem high. Most of the eligible candidates for promotion would probably have "good" to "outstanding" records, and would be qualified for promotion through the grade of Commander; however, there are simply not enough authorized numbers to permit all "qualified" officers to be selected. Some qualified officers will not be selected. Those who are selected then are considered by the board to be those "best fitted" to assume the duties of the next higher grade and to provide a leadership base for the future.

[Ref. 2 p. 5]



It is important to note that the selection board proceedings are not requirements-oriented with respect to individual community's manpower needs. Decisions are understood to be based on past performance that is indicative of future success.

#### D. OTHER PROMOTION PROCESSES

Officer promotions occur under a temporary and permanent grade structure. Except for women officers, all promotions above the rank of Lieutenant junior grade are made by temporary appointments to the next higher grade. Permanent promotions of women are made automatically at the time of selection. All other permanent appointments are processed on the basis of seniority, without another selection process, as vacancies become available in the permanent grade structure of the Navy.

Permanent appointments cannot be revoked except by legal proceedings. Temporary appointments can be terminated by the President with the individual reverting back to his permanent grade. Such termination would be made only in the event of drastic reductions in the size of the Navy. During a war or national emergency, temporary promotion of active duty officers can also be made under the provisions of Title Ten.

A final feature of the Navy officer promotion system is the "up or out" policy, which is designed to maintain a "youthful, vigorous, fully combat-ready officer corps".

[Ref. 1 p. 20]

Regular Lieutenants and Lieutenants (junior grade) who twice fail selection to the next higher grade are required





to be honorably discharged with severance pay in the same year that the second pass-over occurs. Lieutenant Commanders, Commanders and Captains who fail to select two times may continue to serve and still remain eligible for promotion. Upon completion of 20, 26 and 30 years of total commissioned service, respectively, they are forced to retire. [Ref. 3 p. 13]



#### IV. LINE OFFICER ATTITUDE SURVEY

Attitude surveys were mailed to 200 Unrestricted Line (URL) Officers at the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) during March 1979. The questionnaire was designed to measure current officer perceptions regarding aspects of the promotion process. The survey design encouraged the participants to comment generally on their overall satisfaction with current promotion policies and related issues.

##### A. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The survey consisted of 19 objective questions (ranking or Likert scaled [Ref. 7 p. 280]) and one open ended question (see Appendix A). The respondents were asked to consider the experiences of friends and shipmates as well as their own in answering each question. Overall opinions were desired. The questionnaire was pre-tested by two representative groups of line officers and care was taken to write questions so as to eliminate or minimize biasing of responses.

Survey participants were selected randomly from the files of URL officer students attending NPS. Table I describes the grade and designator distribution of the 128 survey respondents. It is important to note that this sample is not perfectly representative of the entire U.S. Navy URL population for the following reasons:

(1) Due to pre-screening and assignment policies, the NPS population may not be totally representative of the



entire URL.

(2) No attempt was made to achieve a representative sample whose grade and designator distribution approximated that of the URL. The overriding consideration was to attempt to ensure a numerically significant sample of each officer designator.

TABLE I: POPULATION OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

| <u>OFFICER<br/>DESIGNATOR</u> | <u>GRADES</u> |             |           |             |          |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|----------|
|                               | <u>CDR</u>    | <u>LCDR</u> | <u>LT</u> | <u>LTJG</u> | <u>n</u> |
| 1100 (W)                      | 0             | 3           | 7         | 0           | 10       |
| 1110                          | 3             | 25          | 9         | 0           | 37       |
| 1120                          | 0             | 4           | 12        | 1           | 17       |
| 1310                          | 0             | 24          | 13        | 0           | 37       |
| 1320                          | 0             | 9           | 18        | 0           | 27       |
| <hr/>                         |               |             |           |             |          |
| n                             | 3             | 65          | 59        | 1           | 128      |
|                               |               |             |           |             | N        |

Note 1: 1100 (W) ... female unrestricted line officers  
1110 ..... surface warfare officers  
1120 ..... submariners  
1310 ..... pilots  
1320 ..... Naval flight officers

Note 2: The original sample of 200 was determined by the following methodology:

(A) Due to the numerically small representation of 1100 (W) and 1120 communities at the NPS, all members of each group were surveyed.

(B) For the remaining communities, all Commanders and Lieutenant Commanders were polled in order to tap a maximum of overall experience with the promotion process. Beyond this, no attempt was made to ensure an identical grade structure among designators.



One final aspect of the survey methodology that may have impact on any analysis of attitudes between officer designators is the possible effects of officer rank. From Table I, it can be shown that the majority of respondents for the 1110 (surface) and 1310 (pilot) communities were Lieutenant Commanders and above (52 of 74) whereas the majority for the 1120 (submarine) and 1320 (NFO) communities were Lieutenants and below (31 of 44). The overall survey results suggest that NFO's and submariners (which are also the more junior groups) exhibited attitudes that, for some questions, could be considered more polarized than those expressed by the group having more senior officers. Although it is not the purpose of this study to correlate officer grade with attitudes, one should be aware that rank (or age) may be more indicative of group dispositions than, for example, a warfare specialty or a certain kind of work experience.

## B. OFFICER SURVEY RESULTS

The following results are organized in the same order as questions in the questionnaire. The statistical analyses for most of the questions are reported here in a simple matrix format. In some instances, only the overall sample response is provided; however, the data are often presented broken down by officer designator for the individual readers' interest as well as to facilitate future utilization of the data.





### Question 1

How well do you understand the Navy's officer promotion system?

- A. Thorough understanding
- B. Good understanding
- C. Adequate understanding
- D. Little understanding
- E. Very little understanding

Response: (percentage totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding)

TABLE II: OFFICER UNDERSTANDING OF PROMOTION SYSTEM

| <u>CHOICE</u>                 | <u>1100W</u> | <u>1110</u> | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             |             | <u>Overall</u> | <u>n</u> |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------|
|                               |              |             | <u>1120</u>       | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> |                |          |
|                               |              |             | <u>PERCENTAGE</u> |             |             |                |          |
| Through<br>under-<br>standing | 0            | 27          | 0                 | 12          | 11          | 14             | 17       |
| Good                          | 50           | 41          | 59                | 68          | 44          | 52             | 65       |
| Adequate                      | 20           | 16          | 35                | 9           | 26          | 19             | 24       |
| Little                        | 30           | 16          | 6                 | 12          | 19          | 15             | 19       |
| Very<br>little                | 0            | 0           | 0                 | 0           | 0           | 0              | 0        |
| n                             | 10           | 37          | 17                | 34          | 27          | 125            |          |

Overall, 85% of the officers indicated that they had at least an adequate understanding of the promotion process. Based on interviews conducted during the survey pre-test periods, it was apparent that most of the officers had a basic understanding of the officer promotion process; however, few were aware of the complex mechanics and legal constraints of the system. This question was designed primarily to obtain a very general measure of the confidence that might be placed



in the survey results. This question was also intended to determine whether there was a need for education regarding the promotion process.

Question 2

How satisfied are you with the overall present system?

- A. Very satisfied
- B. Satisfied
- C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- D. Dissatisfied
- E. Very dissatisfied

Response:

TABLE III: OFFICER SATISFACTION WITH PROMOTION SYSTEM

|                   | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             |             |             |             |                |          |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------|
| <u>CHOICE</u>     | <u>1100W</u>      | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> | <u>Overall</u> | <u>n</u> |
|                   | <u>PERCENTAGE</u> |             |             |             |             |                |          |
| Very Satisfied    | 0                 | 13          | 6           | 18          | 0           | 10             | 12       |
| Satisfied         | 50                | 58          | 53          | 38          | 48          | 49             | 62       |
| Neutral           | 40                | 24          | 24          | 21          | 30          | 25             | 32       |
| Dissatisfied      | 10                | 5           | 18          | 21          | 22          | 15             | 19       |
| Very Dissatisfied | 0                 | 0           | 0           | 3           | 0           | 01             | 1        |
| n                 | 10                | 38          | 17          | 34          | 27          | 126            |          |

Overall, 59% of the sample indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the promotion system. The responses of the several designator groupings were similar to one another. Important differences are obtained when ratios of satisfied to unsatisfied responses are calculated for each grouping. Aviators (1310/1320) responded with much less enthusiasm for the current system than did the rest of the



sample, especially 1110's.

### Question 3

Do you feel any significant improvements could be made to the current system? Consider overall promotion opportunities and flow points, the up or out system, any possible inequities among unrestricted line designator groups, effectiveness of promotion boards, dependence on fitness reports, etc. Please write specific answers: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

The written responses to this question varied; however, several recommendations for improvement were persistent. Many officers felt that changes to the fitness report process were necessary in order to improve the promotion system. Most agreed that inflated fitness report marks must create an extremely difficult problem for selection boards to overcome. Several respondents recommended that an administrative procedure be established by which an officer might be able to discard one negative fitness report that was at least a specified number of years old. It was noted that selection boards, hard-pressed to discriminate between officers to select and to pass-over, are forced to grasp at any sign of weakness in an officer's career and eliminate the individual from further consideration. Thus, a weak early fitness report could possibly penalize an individual for an entire career. Of primary concern here is the commanding officer who evaluates officers based on a literal translation of the fitness report form, thus doing a disservice to them.

Many officers wrote that the "up or out" system should be eliminated or revised. The main theme was that consideration should be given to retaining those passed-over officers whose



skills are in demand by the Navy. These recommendations were usually qualified by adding that these individuals should be considered on a case-by-case basis, ensuring that only satisfactory performers be given the opportunity to continue on active duty beyond the current legal constraints. It was also mentioned that twice passed-over Lieutenants should not be considered in such a process, implying that their performance was probably too marginal to allow them additional consideration. One officer recommended that all individuals allowed to serve under such an arrangement be subject to periodic review and approval. Survey question 20 deals exclusively with the "up or out" system and should be examined for other views on this feature of the promotion process.

A third item frequently mentioned concerned early (deep) selections. The recommendations offered varied from, "increasing the total number of deep selects," to "early selection only when the needs of the Navy require more officers in a certain grade." The basis for deep selection was the area to which most respondents directed their attention. Several participants thought that the decisions for early selection were often based on factors that were not clear to the peers of those selected.

Other responses to Question 3 included appeals for the selection process to put more emphasis on sea duty, the removal of the "magic and secrecy" from the selection boards, greater consistency between annual selection boards, and a recommendation that promotion opportunity should be regulated





to provide equal opportunities among the various officer groups and warfare specialties within the Unrestricted Line.

As a final comment, it may be important to note that approximately 15% of the survey population did not answer question 3, and another 10% wrote that no significant changes were needed because the present system was satisfactory.

#### Question 4

Upon completing your initial term of obligated service, to what extent did your expected promotion opportunities influence your decision to continue a career in the Navy?

- A. Very strong influence
- B. Considerable influence
- C. Some influence
- D. Little influence
- E. Very little influence

Response:

TABLE IV: PROMOTION OPPORTUNITY INFLUENCE ON CAREER DECISION

|                        | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             |             |             |             |                |          |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------|
| <u>CHOICE</u>          | <u>1100W</u>      | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> | <u>Overall</u> | <u>n</u> |
|                        | <u>PERCENTAGE</u> |             |             |             |             |                |          |
| Very strong influence  | 10                | 8           | 6           | 6           | 15          | 09             | 11       |
| Considerable influence | 20                | 29          | 41          | 45          | 48          | 38             | 48       |
| Some influence         | 40                | 37          | 41          | 21          | 22          | 30             | 38       |
| Little influence       | 30                | 16          | 0           | 18          | 15          | 15             | 19       |
| Very little influence  | 0                 | 11          | 12          | 9           | 0           | 07             | 9        |
| n                      | 10                | 38          | 17          | 33          | 27          | 125            |          |



The main purpose of this question was to obtain an indicator of just how important promotion opportunities are in officer retention. Over 47% of the sample stated that their expected promotion opportunities had a significant (very strong or considerable) impact on their decision to remain in the service. Perhaps even more indicative of the importance of promotion opportunities is the ratio of those who felt promotion was a factor to those who did not - overall, a two to one relationship (e.g. 59 "considerable" and "very strong influence" responses compared to only 28 "little" and "very little influence" responses). Several of those who attested to the importance of promotion opportunities stated that job satisfaction and duty station assignment were much more important determiners of continuance upon completion of minimum obligated service.



### Question 5

Regarding your response to question 4, was the promotion opportunity influence:

A. Based more on negative aspects of the up or out system (i.e. fears of being passed over, thus risking involuntary separation prior to retirement eligibility)?

B. Based more on overall promotion opportunities through the ranks toward your career goals?

C. About equal between choices A and B?

D. Other aspects: \_\_\_\_\_

Response:

TABLE V: ASPECTS OF PROMOTION INFLUENCE

| <u>CHOICE</u>         | <u>1100W</u> | <u>1110</u> | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             |             | <u>Overall</u> | <u>n</u> |
|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------|
|                       |              |             | <u>1120</u>       | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> |                |          |
|                       |              |             | <u>PERCENTAGE</u> |             |             |                |          |
| Negative aspects      | 0            | 06          | 18                | 14          | 14          | 11             | 11       |
| Overall opportunities | 89           | 81          | 73                | 61          | 62          | 71             | 71       |
| Equal A/B             | 11           | 13          | 09                | 25          | 24          | 18             | 18       |
| n                     | 9            | 31          | 11                | 28          | 21          | 100            |          |

The purpose of Question 5 was to attempt to measure the importance each officer placed on the risk of being involuntarily separated if "passed over" twice for promotion to Lieutenant Commander (refer to page 26 of Chapter 3 for explanation of involuntary separation). Although only a few officers indicated that the "out" aspects of the "up or out" system (specifically, failure to be selected for Lieutenant Commander) were their main concerns with the Navy's promotion system, some commented that failure to be selected for LCDR after a ten year self-investment in the Navy was a high price to pay. One aviation officer recommended that the time for



the legal vested career decision be moved up from eleven or twelve years to the sixth or seventh year to be coincident with the completion of one sea and one shore tour. Thus, neither the Navy nor the officer would expend time on an unpromising career.

Over 70% of the respondents were more concerned with their overall promotion opportunities than with specific features such as the "up or out" provisions.

For Questions 6-8, 10, and 13, the respondents were asked to rank each answer category based on the importance or other factor stated by the individual question.





## Question 6

How important to you were the following benefits of your last promotion?

- A. Economic factors
- B. Peer status
- C. Self-fulfillment
- D. Stepping stone toward career goals
- E. Benefits of rank
- F. Other (fill in) \_\_\_\_\_

Response: Averaging the rankings (1 to 6 with 1 highest) assigned by respondents from each designator yielded the following:

TABLE VI: IMPORTANCE OF LAST PROMOTION

| <u>FACTOR</u>    | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             |             |             |             | <u>Overall</u> |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
|                  | <u>1100W</u>      | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> |                |
| Economic         | 3.0               | 2.9         | 2.0         | 3.0         | 2.2         | 2.7            |
| Peer status      | 4.4               | 3.7         | 3.2         | 3.3         | 3.7         | 3.6            |
| Self-fulfillment | 1.9               | 1.9         | 1.9         | 2.3         | 2.5         | 2.2            |
| Stepping stone   | 1.9               | 2.3         | 2.9         | 2.3         | 2.8         | 2.4            |
| Benefits of rank | 4.6               | 4.3         | 4.3         | 3.9         | 4.0         | 4.2            |
| n                | 10                | 38          | 17          | 33          | 26          | 124            |

Note: Each cell contains an averaged rating, e.g. overall (far right column), the officers chose "self-fulfillment" (average = 2.2) as the most important result of their last promotion.

As a whole, it was clear that the sample perceived increased "self-fulfillment" and "stepping stone to career goals" as the most important benefits of their last promotion. Both submariners and NFO's ranked "economic factors" very high compared to the responses from other sub-groups. Women



officers, on the other hand, placed great importance on the "self" and "career" oriented choices. Two of the women indicated that their promotion to Lieutenant Commander furnished them with extra credibility in dealing with superiors.

Several individuals commented that promotion is increasing in importance as an economic factor. They stated that because the "capped" annual pay comparability raises fail to keep pace with the high rate of inflation, the only way for service personnel to maintain a given standard of living is through promotion coupled with longevity pay raises.

It is interesting to note that while most respondents assigned little value to "benefits of rank" (several commented that they were nonexistent), a few allotted considerable importance to this category, with several officers exclaiming that the finest benefit of their last promotion was, "getting off the watchbill".



Questions 7 and 8 (note the wording for Question 8 is included within parentheses).

Under the present promotion system, to what extent are (should) the following factors important as determinants of individual officer promotion?

- A. Fitness report evaluations
- B. Past jobs, sea duty and career pattern
- C. Officer designator or warfare specialty
- D. Composition of selection board members
- E. Schools attended, proven subspecialties

Response:

TABLE VII: FACTORS OF INDIVIDUAL OFFICER PROMOTION

|                   | Question 7<br>"Are Factors" | Question 8<br>"Should Be Factors" |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <u>CHOICE</u>     |                             |                                   |
| FitRep            | 1.4                         | 1.7                               |
| Career Pattern    | 2.3                         | 2.0                               |
| Warfare Specialty | 3.4                         | 3.5                               |
| Board Composition | 3.7                         | 4.9                               |
| Subspecialties    | 4.0                         | 3.5                               |
| n                 | 125                         | 122                               |

Note: Numbers represent rankings of each factor (lowest number implies the most importance) assigned by the entire URL sample.

The subgroups (designators) were similar in their answers to the two questions. All agreed that the officer fitness report and one's past career pattern were largely responsible for selection/non-selection to a higher rank. An officer's warfare specialty/designator followed as the third most important determinant.

An argument made by several of the respondents was that the rankings would shift for selection to different ranks.



For example, subspecialties and past career pattern may be of more importance to a Captain selection board than to a more junior board. Most officers agreed that the fitness report is losing credibility as an indicator of officer performance and therefore should be assigned less value in the selection process.

#### Question 9

In the long run, how would you rate your promotion opportunities (opportunity for authority and responsibility) with those of similarly educated and talented people in civilian industry?

- A. Far superior
- B. Better
- C. About equal
- D. Not as good
- E. Far inferior
- F. Do not know

Response:

TABLE VIII: CIVILIAN VS. MILITARY OPPORTUNITY

| <u>CHOICE</u> | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             |             |             |             | <u>Overall</u> | <u>n</u> |
|---------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------|
|               | <u>1100W</u>      | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> |                |          |
| Far superior  | 30                | 19          | 29          | 06          | 07          | 15             | 19       |
| Better        | 50                | 41          | 29          | 38          | 30          | 37             | 46       |
| About equal   | 20                | 19          | 18          | 29          | 22          | 22             | 28       |
| Not as good   | 0                 | 16          | 18          | 15          | 26          | 17             | 21       |
| Far inferior  | 0                 | 03          | 06          | 06          | 15          | 06             | 8        |
| Do not know   | 0                 | 03          | 0           | 06          | 0           | 02             | 3        |
| n             | 10                | 37          | 17          | 34          | 27          | 125            |          |





Overall, 52% of the officers felt their promotion opportunities were greater in the Navy than in civilian industry. The remaining individuals were equally split in selecting the "about equal" and the inferior choices.

Naval flight officers were unique in their opinions regarding promotion opportunities within the Navy - 41% said their opportunities were inferior to those of civilians, whereas only 37% felt the opposite was true. In contrast, all of the women officers rated Navy opportunities equal to or greater than those of their civilian counterparts. These results tend to support the assertion that opportunities are greater for women (both officer and enlisted) in the military than in the civilian sector. It is also interesting to note that a significant number of males took care to distinguish between economic opportunity and opportunity for increased authority and responsibility. Their written comments indicated that they thought Navy pay was not commensurate with their responsibility.



Question 10

How would you rate overall Naval Officer promotion opportunities with those of the other services? Rank each service by assigning numbers (1 to 5, 1 is best) by each service or circle answer F or G.

- A. Army
- B. Air Force
- C. Navy
- D. Marine Corps
- E. Coast Guard
- F. Each service about equal
- G. Do not know

Response:

TABLE IX: COMPARISON OF PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES  
FOR THE MILITARY SERVICES

| <u>SERVICE</u>    | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             |             |             |             | <u>Overall</u> |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
|                   | <u>1100W</u>      | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> |                |
| USA               | 3.9               | 3.2         | 3.4         | 3.4         | 3.2         | 3.3            |
| USAF              | 3.7               | 3.3         | 3.1         | 3.5         | 2.5         | 3.2            |
| USN               | 1.0               | 1.3         | 1.2         | 1.3         | 1.5         | 1.3            |
| USMC              | 3.3               | 3.2         | 2.9         | 3.3         | 4.1         | 3.3            |
| USCG              | 2.8               | 3.0         | 4.3         | 2.9         | 3.2         | 3.2            |
| <u>PERCENTAGE</u> |                   |             |             |             |             |                |
| About equal       | 10                | 0           | 0           | 12          | 15          | 07             |
| Do not know       | 20                | 33          | 35          | 30          | 37          | 33             |
| n                 | 10                | 36          | 17          | 33          | 27          | 123            |

As shown in Table IX, the participants who provided rankings thought that officer promotion opportunities were greater in the Navy than in all other services, which were ranked about equal to each other. Approximately 33% stated that they did not know what differences existed between the services and only 7% thought that officer promotion was about



equal among the services.

Based on a study conducted in 1978 (see Appendix B), USN promotion rates (percentage selected) over the 1974-1978 period were less than that for the Army and Coast Guard and only slightly better than that experienced by Air Force and Marine Corps officers. On the other hand, Naval officers enjoyed significantly earlier flow points (LCDR through CAPT) than did any other service. For example, the average flow point to O-4 for Naval officers, 1974-1978, was 9 years compared to a combined average of 10 years 4 months for the other services. Similarly, flow points to O-5 and O-6 were less for the USN than for the other services. Although it is difficult to mesh promotion opportunity rates with promotion time flows, it is clear that Naval officers as a whole have had better promotion opportunities (at least in recent peacetime) than their counterparts in the other services.



Question 11

How important is (or was) it to you to attain each of the following grades:

LCDR \_\_\_\_\_ CDR \_\_\_\_\_ CAPT \_\_\_\_\_ FLAG \_\_\_\_\_  
(assign the following letters)

- A. Very important
- B. Important
- C. Not really important
- D. My current plans do not include this rank attainment.
- E. Have not thought about it

Response:

As expected, almost everyone thought it was "Very important" to be selected for Lieutenant Commander (mainly for retirement eligibility- see Chapter 3, p. 25). Responses were split equally between "Very important" and "Important" in describing how important it was to be selected to Commander. Over two-thirds thought it was important to achieve Captain, and over 21% of the officers indicated aspirations to Flag rank (8% selected "Very important").





## Question 12

At what point do you plan to retire from the Navy?

- A. 30 years or more of service
- B. 21 to 29 years
- C. At the 20 year point
- D. Will leave the Navy before retirement eligibility

Response:

TABLE X: INTENDED RETIREMENT POINT (LENGTH OF SERVICE)

| <u>CHOICE</u><br>(years) | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             |             |             |             |                | <u>n</u> |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------|
|                          | <u>1100W</u>      | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> | <u>Overall</u> |          |
|                          | <u>PERCENTAGE</u> |             |             |             |             |                |          |
| 30+                      | 20                | 08          | 12          | 03          | 0           | 06             | 8        |
| 21-29                    | 0                 | 58          | 29          | 39          | 33          | 39             | 49       |
| 20                       | 20                | 24          | 06          | 42          | 22          | 26             | 32       |
| Prior to 20              | 10                | 0           | 12          | 0           | 04          | 03             | 4        |
| Undecided                | 50                | 11          | 41          | 15          | 41          | 26             | 32       |
| n                        | 10                | 38          | 17          | 33          | 27          | 125            |          |

Over 70% of the Postgraduate School officers signified an intention to remain with the Navy at least twenty years. As one might expect, the career intentions correlate more closely with rank and length of service (LOS) than with designator. (Note the differences between the relatively junior groups 1100W, 1120 and 1320, and the more senior 1110's and 1310's.) As an aside, it is interesting to compare the length of service intentions of Question 12 with the rank attainment expectations stated previously.



### Question 13

Over the past several years, how would you rate overall promotion opportunities (0-4 to 0-6) among various officer designator groups? Rank each designator by assigning numbers (1 to 5, 1 is highest) by each group or circle A or G.

- A. All designators approximately equal
- B. 1100 Women Unrestricted Line ..... \_\_\_\_\_
- C. 1110 Surface Warfare..... \_\_\_\_\_
- D. 1120 Submarine Warfare ..... \_\_\_\_\_
- E. 1310 Pilot ..... \_\_\_\_\_
- F. 1320 Naval Flight Officer ..... \_\_\_\_\_
- G. Do not know

Response:

TABLE XI: URL DESIGNATOR PROMOTION OPPORTUNITY

#### DESIGNATORS RATED

| <u>RATER<br/>GROUPS</u> | <u>1100W</u> | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> | <u>n</u> |
|-------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------|
| 1100W                   | 2.8          | 2.8         | 2.6         | 2.6         | 4.2         | 5        |
| 1110                    | 3.1          | 3.5         | 1.6         | 1.9         | 3.9         | 23       |
| 1120                    | 3.0          | 3.5         | 1.5         | 2.1         | 3.5         | 15       |
| 1310                    | 3.1          | 3.3         | 1.3         | 2.6         | 3.6         | 25       |
| 1320                    | 3.2          | 3.7         | 1.4         | 2.5         | 3.9         | 20       |
| Overall                 | 3.1          | 3.4         | 1.5         | 2.3         | 3.8         | 88       |

Note: Each cell contains an averaged rating, e.g. overall (bottom row), it was believed that 1120's enjoyed the highest promotion opportunity (1.5), followed by 1310's (2.3) etc. The numbers should be compared only in the context of the assigned rankings.

In addition to the 88 officers who assigned values to each designator, only 6 thought that promotion opportunity was approximately equal among designators and 27 people indicated they did not know. To summarize the responses to Question 13, submariners' promotion opportunities were ranked highest, followed by pilots' promotion opportunities,



then the promotion opportunities for women, surface officers, and finally NFO's. This ranking is supported by a count of first place "votes" assigned to each designator: 1120 (61), 1310 (18), 1100 (17), and 1110 and 1320 (both 0). The question drew strong comments from several participants. The officers responding to the question felt that the Navy was using promotion as an incentive for retention of submariners, and to a lesser extent, Navy pilots. That is, they believed that the high promotion success of submariners, for example, was built into the promotion system as a means of retaining experienced, nuclear trained officers.



Question 14

How would your reaction be if promotion opportunity was used as a tool to adjust retention rates of certain designators in short supply (i.e. higher promotion rates could serve as an incentive to remain in the Navy)?

- A. Strongly agree
- B. Agree
- C. Neutral
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly disagree

Response:

TABLE XII: PROMOTION AS A TOOL TO ADJUST RETENTION RATES

| <u>CHOICE</u>     | <u>1100W</u> | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             | <u>Overall</u> | <u>n</u> |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|----------------|----------|
|                   |              |             |             | <u>1310</u>       | <u>1320</u> |                |          |
|                   |              |             |             | <u>PERCENTAGE</u> |             |                |          |
| Strongly agree    | 0            | 03          | 13          | 09                | 07          | 07             | 8        |
| Agree             | 10           | 14          | 47          | 18                | 15          | 19             | 23       |
| Neutral           | 20           | 05          | 0           | 09                | 04          | 07             | 8        |
| Disagree          | 30           | 27          | 20          | 41                | 26          | 30             | 37       |
| Strongly disagree | 40           | 51          | 20          | 24                | 48          | 38             | 47       |
| n                 | 10           | 37          | 15          | 34                | 27          | 123            |          |

Overall, 68% disagreed with the concept of using promotion opportunity as an incentive to retain officers in short supply. Only the submariner group agreed with the idea. Many officers wrote that this practice is presently in effect for the nuclear submariners, and, to a lesser extent, for Navy pilots. Several officers who strongly disagreed with using promotion opportunity to retain officers stated that special pay and bonuses should be the only incentives used to retain certain skilled people, not the promotion system. Other officers believed





that increased attrition within a skill category naturally boosts the effective promotion rate without any other adjustment being made.

Question 15

Under present laws, the sole requisite for determining promotion selections is the "best fitted" criterion. Do you think that the needs of the Navy with respect to the supply and demand of officer skill categories should override this criterion during the selection process?

- A. Strongly agree
- B. Agree
- C. Neutral
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly disagree

Response:

TABLE XIII: "NEEDS OF THE NAVY" VS. "BEST FITTED CRITERION"

| <u>CHOICE</u>     | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             |             |             |             |                | <u>n</u> |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------|
|                   | <u>1100W</u>      | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> | <u>Overall</u> |          |
| Strongly agree    | 0                 | 05          | 12          | 03          | 04          | 05             | 6        |
| Agree             | 30                | 16          | 29          | 32          | 19          | 24             | 30       |
| Neutral           | 40                | 16          | 18          | 21          | 11          | 18             | 23       |
| Disagree          | 10                | 35          | 18          | 29          | 33          | 29             | 36       |
| Strongly disagree | 20                | 27          | 24          | 15          | 33          | 24             | 30       |
| n                 | 10                | 37          | 17          | 34          | 27          | 125            |          |

This question was designed to introduce the "needs of the Navy" and the "best fitted criterion" into the promotion incentive idea introduced by Question 14. Results of both questions exhibited considerable variation; however, the ratio of for/against responses was greater when the "needs of the



Navy" factor was introduced. Still, it is clear a majority of officers opposed the idea.

#### Question 16

Do you feel that promotion rate and timing for men and women officers should be the same in view of the current restrictions on women going to sea and entering certain warfare specialties?

- A. Strongly agree
- B. Agree
- C. Neutral
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly disagree

Response:

TABLE XIV: ATTITUDES REGARDING PROMOTION  
RATE AND TIMING FOR WOMEN

|                   | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             |             |             |             |                |          |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------|
| <u>CHOICE</u>     | <u>1100W</u>      | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> | <u>Overall</u> | <u>n</u> |
|                   | <u>PERCENTAGE</u> |             |             |             |             |                |          |
| Strongly agree    | 60                | 26          | 12          | 18          | 19          | 23             | 29       |
| Agree             | 10                | 32          | 24          | 32          | 23          | 27             | 34       |
| Neutral           | 10                | 16          | 18          | 21          | 27          | 19             | 24       |
| Disagree          | 20                | 08          | 24          | 15          | 15          | 14             | 18       |
| Strongly disagree | 0                 | 18          | 24          | 15          | 15          | 16             | 20       |
| n                 | 10                | 28          | 17          | 34          | 26          | 125            |          |

Overall, 50% agreed that promotion should be equal for men and women, 19% were neutral and about 30% disagreed. About 55% of male officers agreed that promotion rate and timing should equal for women, whereas 70% of the women agreed.



### Question 17

At the present time there are separate promotion boards for male and female unrestricted line officers. Do you agree with this system?

- A. Strongly agree
- B. Agree
- C. Neutral
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly disagree

Response:

TABLE XV: ATTITUDES REGARDING THE INTEGRATION  
OF PROMOTION BOARDS

| <u>CHOICE</u>     | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             |             |             |             |                | <u>n</u> |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------|
|                   | <u>1100W</u>      | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> | <u>Overall</u> |          |
|                   | <u>PERCENTAGE</u> |             |             |             |             |                |          |
| Strongly agree    | 50                | 34          | 12          | 12          | 15          | 22             | 28       |
| Agree             | 40                | 29          | 41          | 47          | 19          | 34             | 43       |
| Neutral           | 10                | 05          | 0           | 09          | 15          | 08             | 10       |
| Disagree          | 0                 | 24          | 18          | 26          | 19          | 21             | 26       |
| Strongly disagree | 0                 | 08          | 29          | 06          | 31          | 14             | 18       |
| n                 | 10                | 38          | 17          | 34          | 26          | 125            |          |

From the above table, it is apparent that 90% of female URL's were against the integration of URL promotion boards. The question elicited strong comments from several women regarding the proposed "equalization" under DOPMA. These officers felt that they would be at a distinct disadvantage if promotion boards were integrated because of the restrictions on sea duty and warfare specialties that were imposed on women. Each 1100(W) respondent qualified her answer by adding that a



single URL board would be appropriate once career opportunities were truly equal for women. A majority of male officers felt the concept of separate boards served the best interests of women officers under present circumstances.

### Question 18

If male and female line officers were reviewed together by the same selection board, do you think women should have promotion rates guaranteed to be at least equal to their male counterparts?

- A. Strongly agree
- B. Agree
- C. Neutral
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly disagree

Response:

TABLE XVI: ATTITUDES REGARDING THE GUARANTEE  
OF PROMOTION RATES FOR WOMEN

|                   | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             |             |             |             |                |          |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------|
| <u>CHOICE</u>     | <u>1100W</u>      | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> | <u>Overall</u> | <u>n</u> |
|                   | <u>PERCENTAGE</u> |             |             |             |             |                |          |
| Strongly agree    | 70                | 08          | 0           | 12          | 15          | 15             | 18       |
| Agree             | 0                 | 14          | 06          | 12          | 19          | 12             | 15       |
| Neutral           | 20                | 03          | 0           | 09          | 15          | 08             | 10       |
| Disagree          | 0                 | 30          | 31          | 38          | 19          | 28             | 34       |
| Strongly disagree | 10                | 46          | 63          | 29          | 31          | 37             | 46       |
| n                 | 10                | 37          | 16          | 34          | 26          | 123            |          |

Most of the URL women agreed with a guaranteed promotion rate, much in line with the guaranteed line fraction granted to restricted line officers[See Ref. 6 p. 69]for additional





information]. The men, however, voiced strong disagreement with the idea. Overall, 70% of the men disagreed, and interestingly, submariners were nearly unanimous in their disapproval with 10 of 16 selecting "Strongly disagree". Often comments were written objecting not only to a guaranteed rate for women but also to the current practice of guaranteeing staff corps promotion rates as well. Only 23% of the men supported guaranteed promotion rates for women.

#### Question 19

If longevity pay raises were tied to rank instead of total time in service, how would it affect the importance you place on promotion?

- A. Much more important
- B. More important
- C. Equal importance
- D. Less importance
- E. Much less importance

Response:

Overall, 69% of the 119 respondents indicated that promotion would gain greater importance if pay raises were more dependent on rank than length of service. This question was designed to measure possible attitude changes if such pay proposals were approved in the future [Ref. 8 p. 5] (The President's Commission on Military Compensation recommended that longevity pay increases should be based on time in grade, not time in service, as a way to enhance the pay of superior performers who advance rapidly through the ranks). Twenty-eight percent of the officers stated that there would no changes in their attitudes regarding promotion if such a proposal were put into effect.



## Question 20

Do you agree with the "up or out" philosophy of the officer promotion system?

- A. Strongly agree
- B. Agree
- C. Neutral
- D. Disagree
- E. Strongly disagree

Response:

TABLE XVII: ATTITUDES REGARDING THE UP OR OUT POLICY

| <u>CHOICE</u>     | <u>DESIGNATOR</u> |             |             |             |             |                | <u>n</u> |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------|
|                   | <u>1100W</u>      | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> | <u>Overall</u> |          |
|                   | <u>PERCENTAGE</u> |             |             |             |             |                |          |
| Strongly agree    | 10                | 18          | 29          | 09          | 11          | 15             | 19       |
| Agree             | 30                | 32          | 18          | 29          | 26          | 28             | 35       |
| Neutral           | 0                 | 13          | 12          | 18          | 04          | 11             | 14       |
| Disagree          | 50                | 24          | 29          | 15          | 41          | 28             | 35       |
| Strongly disagree | 10                | 13          | 12          | 29          | 19          | 18             | 23       |
| n                 | 10                | 38          | 17          | 34          | 27          | 126            |          |

Opinions regarding "up or out" varied considerably. The prevalent opinion of the policy supporters was that "up or out" was necessary to keep the "dead wood" personnel at a minimum, thus ensuring room for growth for younger, better performing officers. Most of these people reasoned that any officer worth his salt would have no problem progressing at least through the rank of Commander.

Those who opposed the "up or out" policy argued that the feature was costly to the Navy because many passed-over officers whose performance was satisfactory were forced to separate, despite the fact that their skills may be in demand.



## V. HISTORICAL PROMOTION DATA

The United States Code, Title 10 states that only the "best-fitted" military officers should be promoted to higher ranks. The law also specifies that all Unrestricted Line Officers of the same rank will be considered for promotion together before a single selection board. The Navy, of course, consists of numerous "communities" within the URL, RL and Staff corps. This chapter presents a summary of historical promotion rates of the five major designator categories within the URL: women line officers, surface warfare officers, submariners, pilots and Naval flight officers. Only regular Navy officers were included; reserve officers, special warfare officers and personnel undergoing warfare specialty training are excluded. These data may serve to exhibit past promotion rate differences between or among the designator groups in question, or, stated differently, show what communities have been considered the "best-fitted" by past promotion boards. A comparison of male and female officer promotion results is also presented in Appendix C.

### A. DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY

URL promotion data were originally obtained from "Navy Times" promotion analysis articles for Fiscal Years 1970 to 1979. These data were later validated and reorganized (see Appendix D, Note 3) using official USN officer promotion files accessed through the courtesy of OP-130 personnel. The selection percentages displayed in the following tables



represent the proportion of the total number of officers selected (below, in, and above the zone) to the number of officers eligible for selection in the regular zone (in-zone). This percentage, called the "line fraction", is used as the accepted measurement in overall promotion planning and reporting. Two alternative promotion fractions are also presented. Although data are available for fiscal years 1970 to 1979, only the data from 1973 to 1979 will be utilized for comparison purposes, because prior to 1973, the 1110 and 1120 designators were combined as a general line officer category. The 1973 to 1979 era is homogenous in that it represents a largely peacetime, All-Volunteer Force Navy existing under a policy of total force reduction. (The number of Naval officers has been reduced from 85,000 in 1968 to 63,000 for 1979.) [Ref. 9 p. 8]

#### B. DATA PRESENTATION

Tables XVIII through XX display historical line fraction results of Lieutenant Commander, Commander and Captain selection boards, respectively. Readers may wish to refer to Appendix D for a more detailed exhibit, including zone analyses as well as actual numbers of personnel selected and eligible.





TABLE XVIII: LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINE FRACTION 1973-1979

| <u>FY</u> | <u>1100W</u> | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> |
|-----------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1973      | .75          | .96         | 1.27        | .87         | .65         |
| 1974      | .71          | .79         | .80         | .75         | .76         |
| 1975      | .75          | .75         | .94         | .75         | .76         |
| 1976      | .75          | .91         | 1.08        | .67         | .65         |
| 1977      | .81          | .79         | .93         | .82         | .83         |
| 1978      | .89          | .89         | .97         | .85         | .83         |
| 1979      | .98          | .98         | 1.04        | .97         | 1.11        |

Note 1: Selection percentages (line fraction) are defined as the total number of selectees above, below and in zone divided by the number of officers eligible in the zone. A percentage of greater than 100% is obtained when the number of all selectees is greater than the number of in zone eligibles.

Note 2: Officer designators defined:

1100(W) ... women line officers  
 1110..... surface warfare officers  
 1120 ..... submarine warfare officers  
 1310 ..... pilots  
 1320 ..... Naval flight officers (NFO's)



TABLE IXX: COMMANDER LINE FRACTION 1973-1979

| <u>FY</u> | <u>1100W</u> | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> |
|-----------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1973      | .75          | .50         | .97         | .88         | 1.00        |
| 1974      | .68          | .72         | 1.00        | .69         | .59         |
| 1975      | .75          | .65         | .99         | .71         | .48         |
| 1976      | .72          | .68         | .80         | .70         | .72         |
| 1977      | .67          | .65         | .83         | .83         | .57         |
| 1978      | .80          | .67         | .89         | .76         | .65         |
| 1979      | .77          | .77         | .90         | .67         | .57         |

TABLE XX: CAPTAIN LINE FRACTION 1973-1979

| <u>FY</u> | <u>1100W</u> | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> |
|-----------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1973      | .67          | .65         | .90         | .50         | .63         |
| 1974      | .64          | .58         | .72         | .59         | .40         |
| 1975      | .60          | .62         | .83         | .54         | .0          |
| 1976      | .67          | .67         | .97         | .53         | .60         |
| 1977      | .67          | .64         | .83         | .56         | .70         |
| 1978      | 1.00         | .53         | 1.00        | .66         | .46         |
| 1979      | .75          | .55         | .77         | .59         | .48         |

Note: Promotion rates for 1320 officers based on a small n. e.g. only 24 Commanders were in the Captain zone between 1973 and 1976.

The preceding data may be summarized further by investigating the overall line fraction by designator for the full period of seven years:



TABLE XXI: AGGREGATE LINE FRACTIONS 1973-1979DESIGNATOR

| <u>GRADE</u> | <u>1100W</u> | <u>1110</u> | <u>1120</u> | <u>1310</u> | <u>1320</u> |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| LCDR         | .86          | .87         | .97         | .81         | .82         |
| CDR          | .74          | .67         | .88         | .73         | .62         |
| CAPT         | .71          | .60         | .84         | .56         | .52         |

In addition to the line fraction, two other promotion measures can be examined. They are illustrated in this thesis only for selection to Lieutenant Commander for fiscal years 1974 through 1978. The first measure,  $P_1$ , is the probability of promotion to Lcdr in a given fiscal year for the entire set of officers who are either below-zone, or in-zone, or above-zone. The second measure of promotion,  $P_2$ , gives the probability of an individual Lieutenant being selected either below-zone, or in-zone, or above-zone. The following comparison provides the line fraction and the two P measures for 1110 designated Lcdr for years 1974-1978:

1110 Lcdr

|      | <u>Line Fraction</u> | <u><math>P_1</math></u> | <u><math>P_2</math></u> |
|------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1974 | .79                  | .31                     | .73                     |
| 1975 | .75                  | .33                     | .71                     |
| 1976 | .91                  | .36                     | .83                     |
| 1977 | .79                  | .29                     | .77                     |
| 1978 | .89                  | .45                     | .85                     |

The assumptions underlying the computations of the P measures are:

1. Passed over officers do not leave the Navy before being considered in above-zone eligibility status.
2. There are no lateral entries and no departures from the system due to death, etc.



3. Below-zone and above-zone eligibles consist of officers one fiscal year below and above the promotion zone, respectively.

If these assumptions are not valid, the results may be misleading; however, the P measure may be used for comparison purposes.  $P_1$  provides a unique measure of the overall selection rate for each fiscal year whereas  $P_2$  provides a measure which estimates the cumulative, conditional selection probability for an individual officer tracking from an early to a late promotion opportunity.

Appendix E contains P measures for each designator for promotion to Lieutenant Commander for fiscal years 1974-1978. Computational formats for  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are also provided.

#### C. DATA ANALYSIS CONCLUSIONS

From these data, the following conclusions can be made:

1. The selection rates for each rank for submarine warfare officers have far exceeded those of the other URL groups.
2. Overall, women officers have fared better in terms of promotions than their male counterparts.
3. Pilots and surface warfare officers, the two largest (in terms of numbers of officers) designator categories, have experienced similar overall promotion rates.
4. Naval flight officers have encountered the lowest selection rates of all the groups considered. This is especially true for selection to the higher ranks, e.g., to Commander and Captain. NFO's have proven very competitive in the last three years for selection to Lieutenant Commander.





5. Average promotion rates for the designators as a whole have averaged 85% for Lieutenant Commander, 71% for Commander and 61% for Captain. These rates are weighted by the total number of officers selected/eligible by designator for Fiscal Years 1973-1979.

These conclusions do not necessarily imply that there are built-in discriminators or bias within the promotion system, nor do they refute such a claim. It is safe to assume that there is ample room for individual interpretation by the selection board members considering the minimal guidance provided by the "best-fitted" criterion and the Secretary of the Navy.

Although overall promotion opportunity remains beyond the control of the board, each member is free to vote as they choose and whether knowingly or unknowingly, each brings with them their own personal set of biases and prejudices regarding the "best-fitted" criterion. One must also consider other factors when comparing promotion successes of officer groups. Nuclear submarine officers undergo extensive pre-screening and meet very high standards before earning their "Dolphins". (Pilots and NFO's are also subject to relatively high standards and pre-screening before entering aviation programs.) The Naval flight officer community is a relatively young designator, thus few cohorts of long-standing professional NFO's have progressed toward the promotion zones for Commander and Captain selection. The recent success enjoyed by NFO's in being selected to Lieutenant Commander may be a prognosis of future success in selection to higher grades.



Likewise, there may be similar reasons for explaining the above-average promotion success of women line officers. The point made in this study is that the URL, considered a single group by promotion laws and policies, consists of several major warfare specialty/designator groups, which, in the recent past, have experienced quite different promotion rates.



## VI. . SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

### A. SUMMARY

It is difficult to generalize concerning a process as vast and complex as the U.S. Navy URL Officer Promotion System. The mechanics are detailed and authority and responsibility are well divided among the Navy, the Secretary of the Navy and the lawmakers. Nevertheless, the promotion system seems to have functioned well in an overall sense. The system is much more improved over the inadequate arrangement that was in effect during World War II, and it has served to help maintain officer grade levels close to the structure required by law. Furthermore, the promotion opportunity data described in Chapter V has shown that fairly consistent promotion opportunities have been maintained over the past ten years.

This thesis has attempted to gain a greater insight into URL officer's attitudes and knowledge of the promotion system. The survey, administered to a wide cross-section of URL officers, should be a reliable gauge of officer attitudes regarding system equity and individual opportunity. Despite many specific areas of concern and varied recommendations for system improvement, most survey respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the present promotion process.

### B. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are direct reflections of actual promotion data as well as officer attitudes measured by the



Naval Postgraduate School survey.

1. The officer promotion system has provided the desired overall URL promotion opportunity while safeguarding promotion equity for successive year groups of officers. Certainly, the promotion system in itself cannot assume full credit for maintaining reasonable opportunities, but during a period of considerable officer force reductions, the system has functioned well.

2. Promotion opportunity is an important factor of officer retention and morale. A large majority of those surveyed indicated that their expected promotion success was considered during the career decision made upon fulfilling their initial obligated service.

3. Promotion is gaining greater importance as an economic factor due to the current trends of inflation and consistent comparability pay caps imposed by the Executive. Similarly, personnel attitudes toward promotion may become more intense if recent proposals [Ref. 8 p. 5] linking longevity pay levels to time in grade rather than time in service are placed into effect. This may also fuel additional competition for early promotion.

4. Perhaps the primary problem with the current promotion system is that selection decisions are based largely on past fitness report performance evaluations which are often difficult to assess. It is often difficult to separate the top performing officers from average performers when the plurality of officers are assigned in the higher performance categories. Added to other depreciating factors such as





personality differences between superiors and subordinates and the halo effect, selection board members could have a difficult task choosing the "best fitted" officers.

5. Several conclusions can be made regarding the surveyed officer's perceptions of promotion opportunity and equity. First, the measured perceptions of opportunity clearly indicate that Navy officers feel they are more fortunate than their counterparts in sister services or in civilian industry, at least in terms of promotion opportunity (with regard to added authority and responsibility, not pay and benefits). In fact, the Navy has enjoyed earlier promotion flow points than the other services and it has been a popular belief that the military offers its officers more responsibility and authority than they could expect from civilian industry.

Perceptions regarding opportunity and equity within the unrestricted line were not consistent with actual promotion data presented in Chapter V. Although it was clear that the survey respondents were aware that submariners as a group enjoyed the best promotion history and Naval flight officers the worst, the survey participants were less correct regarding the remainder of the URL. This can best be determined by a casual comparison of Tables XI (URL Designator Promotion Opportunity) and XXI (Aggregate Line Fractions 1973-1979), or by comparing the overall perceptions of designator promotion opportunity with a conditional cross-sectional description of promotion probability. Opportunity from the starting point of the lieutenant grade through selection to captain is exhibited below:



TABLE XXII. OFFICER PERCEPTIONS VERSUS ACTUAL  
PROMOTION HISTORY 1973-1979

| <u>URL<br/>DESIGNATORS</u> | <u>PERCEIVED RANKINGS<br/>FROM TABLE XI</u> | <u>ACTUAL PROMOTION<br/>PROBABILITIES</u> |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 1100(W)                    | 3.1                                         | .45                                       |
| 1110                       | 3.4                                         | .35                                       |
| 1120                       | 1.5                                         | .72                                       |
| 1310                       | 2.3                                         | .33                                       |
| 1320                       | 3.8                                         | .26                                       |

Note 1: Conditional probabilities are calculated by multiplying average historical line fractions for the ranks LCDR through Captain. E.g. for 1100 (W), averaged line fractions were: LCDR = .86, CDR = .74, CAPT = .71, thus the conditional probability is .45 (.86 x .74 x .71).

Note 2: See Table XI for explanation of the rankings exhibited.

Note 3: The reader is cautioned that the above cross-sectional model has limited applicability with respect to cohorts of people traced over a period of time. It is most appropriate for comparison purposes since it describes the most probable data basis for an individual's career decision.

Interestingly, each designator grouping thought that pilots enjoyed above-average promotion opportunities and some written comments by survey participants suggested that both submariners and pilots were given special consideration in the selection process. In reality, pilots were not selected with any more success than any other designator except for NFO's. As a whole, aviators (pilots and NFO's) experienced the lowest promotion rates of any category. This misconception may be indicative of a widespread belief that selection is being used as a tool to adjust retention rates of officer designators in short supply. Such a perception could be



creating needless dissonance within the organization, at least with respect to Navy pilots.

From a promotion standpoint, women line officers have not been limited by the legal restraints imposed on combat and sea duty positions. As shown in Chapter V, women officers have experienced higher promotion rates than their male counterparts. Unlike the similarly small numbers of senior Naval flight officers, senior women have fared very well for selection to the grade of captain. Both the FY 1979 and 1980 promotion plans set promotion rates to captain at 75 percent for women as compared to 60 percent for male officers.

6. From survey results, it is apparent that there exists little support among URL officers for the use of promotion opportunity as a tool for retention purposes.

7. The proposals that exist under the current version of DOPMA are widely misunderstood and are perceived to be a threat to promotion and career goals by some officers, especially women.



## VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH

The following recommendations may be useful areas for further research. A complete tabulation of historical promotion rates for the URL (Lieutenant Commander to Captain) by officer designator and fiscal year (1973-1979) is provided in Appendix D. Additional research would include:

1. A study of selection board member composition and promotion success by designator group.
2. A feasibility study of possible relaxations of "up or out" provisions of the officer promotion system.
3. A feasibility study on the separation of URL designator groups for promotional considerations.
4. Further research in identifying valid criteria upon which promotion success can be predicted (See Ref. 10 for related work).
5. An analysis of flag rank promotion processes.
6. An analysis of the effect of DOPMA on Navy officer grade structure and promotion opportunity.
7. An analysis of promotion opportunity differences between major communities (patrol aviation, destroyer line, etc.) within designator groups. This could be extended to the restricted line or staff corps as well. (See References 11 and 12 for related work).
8. A comparison of actual promotion percentages to those promotion percentages calculated under a steady state grade structure. Given URL force size and average time spent in





the various grades, differences between calculated and actual promotion rates can be determined. Under certain assumptions, the differences could indicate the extent to which the economic and professional incentives offered by a Navy career are greater than those offered by civilian alternatives.

9. Further study and validation of the alternates to the line fraction methodology ( $P_1$  and  $P_2$  values) provided in Appendix E.



OFFICER PROMOTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Would you please be kind enough to complete this brief questionnaire? Copies of it have been distributed to Navy unrestricted line officers of various designators at NPS.

The questionnaire has been designed to give you an opportunity to express your views on Naval officer promotion processes.

Your responses will be used to help complete a thesis project concerning unrestricted line officer promotion processes and analysis of promotion rates by grade, sex and designator.

Please complete all questions and return the questionnaire in the pre-addressed return envelope to SMC 2275. Any additional comments you may care to enclose will certainly be welcome. Please do not include your name, SSN or SMC number. Individual responses will be kept in strict confidence.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

\* \* \* \* \*

In answering the following questions, please do not limit your views to those based on your own personal experience. Consider the experiences of shipmates, friends, etc. - your overall opinion is desired. Circle or write in your responses. Please try to answer each question. Select only one answer for each multiple choice question. If you have comments, please refer to the question number if applicable and jot them anywhere on the survey sheets.

1. How well do you understand the Navy's officer promotion system?
  - A. Thorough understanding
  - B. Good understanding
  - C. Adequate understanding
  - D. Little understanding
  - E. Very little understanding



2. How satisfied are you with the overall present system?
- A. Very satisfied
  - B. Satisfied
  - C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
  - D. Dissatisfied
  - E. Very dissatisfied
3. Do you feel any significant improvements could be made to the current system? Consider overall promotion opportunities and flow points, the up or out system, any possible inequities among unrestricted line designator groups, effectiveness of promotion boards, dependence on fitness reports, etc. Please write in specific answers: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Upon completing your initial term of obligated service, to what extent did your expected promotion opportunities influence your decision to continue a career in the Navy?
- A. Very strong influence
  - B. Considerable influence
  - C. Some influence
  - D. Little influence
  - E. Very little influence
5. Regarding your response to question 4, was the promotion opportunity influence:
- A. Based more on negative aspects of the up or out system (i.e. fears of being passed over thus risking involuntary separation prior to retirement eligibility)?
  - B. Based more on overall promotion opportunities through the ranks toward your career goals?
  - C. About equal between choices A and B?
  - D. Other aspects: \_\_\_\_\_

FOR THE FOLLOWING THREE QUESTIONS RANK EACH CATEGORY BASED ON ITS IMPORTANCE TO YOU BY ASSIGNING NUMBERS 1 to 6, 1 BEING MOST IMPORTANT.

6. How important to you were the following benefits of your last promotion?
- A. Economic factors . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. Peer status . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. Self-fulfillment . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. Stepping stone toward career goals . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. Benefits of rank . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - F. Other (fill in) \_\_\_\_\_



7. Under the present promotion system, to what extent are the following factors important as determinants of individual officer promotion?
- A. Fitness report evaluations . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. Past jobs, sea duty and career pattern . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. Officer designator or warfare specialty . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. Composition of selection board members . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. Schools attended, proven subspecialties . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - F. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
8. In your opinion, what degree of importance should be assigned to the following factors of promotion?
- A. Fitness report evaluations . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. Past jobs, sea duty and career pattern . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. Officer designator or warfare specialty . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. Composition of selection board members . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. Schools attended, proven subspecialties . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - F. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
9. In the long run, how would you rate your promotion opportunities (opportunity for authority and responsibility) with those of similarly educated and talented people in civilian industry?
- A. Far superior
  - B. Better
  - C. About equal
  - D. Not as good
  - E. Far inferior
  - F. Do not know
10. How would you rate overall Naval officer promotion opportunities with those of the other services? Rank each service by assigning numbers (1 to 5, 1 is best) by each service or circle answer F or G.
- A. Army . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. Air Force . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. Navy . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. Marine Corps . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. Coast Guard . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - F. Each service about equal \_\_\_\_\_
  - G. Do not know
11. How important is (or was) it to you to attain each of the following grades:  
 LCDR \_\_\_\_\_ CDR \_\_\_\_\_ CAPT \_\_\_\_\_ FLAG \_\_\_\_\_  
 (assign the following letters)
- A. Very important
  - B. Important
  - C. Not really important
  - D. My current plans do not include this rank attainment
  - E. Have not thought about it





12. At what point do you currently plan to retire from the Navy?
- A. 30 years or more of service
  - B. 21 to 29 years
  - C. At the 20 year point
  - D. Will leave the Navy before retirement eligibility
  - E. Undecided
13. Over the past several years, how would you rate overall promotion opportunities (O-4 to O-6) among various officer designator groups? Rank each designator by assigning numbers (1 to 5, 1 is highest) by each group or circle A or G.
- A. All designators approximately equal
  - B. 1100 Women Unrestricted Line . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. 1110 Surface Warfare . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. 1120 Submarine Warfare . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. 1310 Pilot . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - F. 1320 Naval Flight Officer . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
  - G. Do not know
14. How would your reaction be if promotion opportunity was used as a tool to adjust retention rates of certain designators in short supply (i.e. higher promotion rates could serve as incentive to remain in the Navy)?
- A. Strongly agree
  - B. Agree
  - C. Neutral
  - D. Disagree
  - E. Strongly disagree
15. Under present laws, the sole requisite for determining promotion selections is the "best fitted" criterion. Do you think that the needs of the Navy with respect to the supply and demand of officer skill categories should override this criterion during the selection process?
- A. Strongly agree
  - B. Agree
  - C. Neutral
  - D. Disagree
  - E. Strongly disagree
16. Do you feel that promotion rate and timing for men and women officers should be the same in view of the current restrictions on women going to sea and entering certain warfare specialties?
- A. Strongly agree
  - B. Agree
  - C. Neutral
  - D. Disagree
  - E. Strongly disagree



17. At the present time there are separate promotion boards for male and female unrestricted line officers. Do you agree with this system?
- A. Strongly agree
  - B. Agree
  - C. Neutral
  - D. Disagree
  - E. Strongly disagree
18. If male and female line officers were reviewed together by the same selection board, do you think women should have promotion rates guaranteed to be at least equal to their male counterparts?
- A. Strongly agree
  - B. Agree
  - C. Neutral
  - D. Disagree
  - E. Strongly disagree
19. If longevity pay raises were tied to rank instead of total time in service, how would it affect the importance you place on promotion?
- A. Much more importance
  - B. More importance
  - C. Equal importance
  - D. Less importance
  - E. Much less importance
20. Do you agree with the "up or out" philosophy of the officer promotion system?
- A. Strongly agree
  - B. Agree
  - C. Neutral
  - D. Disagree
  - E. Strongly disagree

IMPORTANT: PLEASE RECORD THE FOLLOWING DATA

SEX        M        F

RANK        \_\_\_\_\_

DESIGNATOR    \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your responses and comments.



## APPENDIX B

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS PROMOTION OPPORTUNITY AND TIMING

| <u>YEAR</u>         | <u>0-6</u> |       | <u>0-5</u> |       | <u>0-4</u> |       |
|---------------------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|
|                     | %          | PP    | %          | PP    | %          | PP    |
| <u>ARMY</u>         |            |       |            |       |            |       |
| 78                  | 62.6       | 21-7  | 86.6       | 16-2  | 92.6       | 10-10 |
| 77                  | 54.3       | 21-3  | 82.3       | 15-9  | 78.6       | 10-4  |
| 76                  | 58.2       | 21-0  | 78.7       | 15-10 | 79.6       | 10-2  |
| 75                  | 57.0       | 21-0  | 85.0       | 15-10 | 71.0       | 10-2  |
| 74                  | 46.6       | 20-11 | *          | 15-1  | *          | 10-2  |
| <u>NAVY</u>         |            |       |            |       |            |       |
| 78                  | 60         | 21-4  | 70         | 14-5  | 85         | 9-3   |
| 77                  | 60         | 20-10 | 70         | 14-9  | 80         | 9-3   |
| 76                  | 60         | 21-0  | 70         | 15-2  | 75         | 9-0   |
| 75                  | 60         | 21-0  | 70         | 15-9  | 75         | 8-11  |
| 74                  | 60         | 20-9  | 70         | 15-0  | 75         | 8-9   |
| <u>AIR FORCE</u>    |            |       |            |       |            |       |
| 78                  | 50         | 21-5  | 70         | 16-5  | 80         | 11-10 |
| 77                  | 50         | 21-3  | 70         | 16-2  | 80         | 11-5  |
| 76                  | 50         | 21-2  | 70         | 16-3  | 80         | 11-6  |
| 75                  | 50         | 21-0  | 70         | 16-5  | 80         | 11-2  |
| 74                  | 50         | 22-0  | 70         | 16-3  | 80         | 10-10 |
| <u>MARINE CORPS</u> |            |       |            |       |            |       |
| 78                  | 55         | 22-6  | 70         | 16-5  | 79         | 10-11 |
| 77                  | 55         | 21-9  | 70.2       | 16-8  | 80.2       | 10-9  |
| 76                  | 55         | 22-0  | 70         | 16-8  | 80         | 10-3  |
| 75                  | 50         | 21-9  | 70         | 16-6  | 80         | 9-6   |
| 74                  | 55         | 21-6  | 70         | 16-6  | 80         | 9-6   |
| <u>COAST GUARD</u>  |            |       |            |       |            |       |
| 77                  | 86.3       | 21-1  | 88.9       | 14-4  | 88.2       | 9-5   |



Note 1: \* means no promotion board held.

% is the cumulative opportunity for an officer to be selected to the next higher grade.

PP is the total years and months of commissioned service completed by a "due course" officer when he can expect to be promoted.

Note 2: Data source: "Navy Times" May 29, 1978 p. 2. Data include all officers, not just the URL.





## APPENDIX C

MALE AND FEMALE OFFICER SELECTION RATES (PERCENT) 1970-1979

| FY   | <u>LCDR</u> |    | <u>CDR</u>      |    | <u>CAPT</u> |                |
|------|-------------|----|-----------------|----|-------------|----------------|
|      | M           | F  | M               | F  | M           | F <sup>2</sup> |
| 1970 | 85          | 84 | 75              | 76 | 60          | 100            |
| 1971 | 85          | 86 | 75              | 74 | 60          | 100            |
| 1972 | 92          | 88 | 75              | 71 | 60          | 100            |
| 1973 | 75          | 75 | 70              | 75 | 60          | 67             |
| 1974 | 75          | 71 | 70 <sup>3</sup> | 68 | 60          | 64             |
| 1975 | 75          | 75 | 70 <sup>3</sup> | 75 | 60          | 60             |
| 1976 | 75          | 75 | 70 <sup>3</sup> | 72 | 60          | 67             |
| 1977 | 80          | 81 | 70              | 67 | 60          | 67             |
| 1978 | 85          | 89 | 70              | 80 | 60          | 100            |
| 1979 | 97          | 98 | 70              | 77 | 60          | 75             |

Note 1: Selection percentages are defined as the total number of selectees above, below and in zone divided by the number of officers eligible in the zone. These data include all URL designators. Data source: NAVOP 130 promotion files.

Note 2: Promotion rates based on very small n. e.g. only 36 female URL commanders were in the captain zone between 1972 and 1979.

Note 3: Calculations based on "Navy Times" promotion analyses.



## APPENDIX D

URL PROMOTION SELECTION RESULTS BY OFFICER DESIGNATOR  
(FY 1973 to 1979, LCDR to CAPT)

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER SELECTIONS

| <u>FY/<br/>DESIGNATOR</u> | <u>ABOVE<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>BELOW<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>IN<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>IN ZONE<br/>ELIGIBLE</u> | <u>SELECTION<br/>PROPORTION</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u>1979</u><br>1100W      | 5                     | 3                     | 49                 | 58                          | .98                             |
| 1110                      | 18                    | 18                    | 255                | 298                         | .98                             |
| 1120                      | 3                     | 9                     | 107                | 114                         | 1.04                            |
| 1310                      | 42                    | 11                    | 382                | 451                         | .97                             |
| 1320                      | 33                    | 12                    | 205                | 226                         | 1.11                            |
| TOTAL                     | 101                   | 53                    | 998                | 1147                        | 1.00                            |
| <br><u>1978</u><br>1100W  | <br>2                 | <br>0                 | <br>31             | <br>37                      | <br>.89                         |
| 1110                      | 8                     | 15                    | 331                | 400                         | .89                             |
| 1120                      | 2                     | 11                    | 135                | 153                         | .97                             |
| 1310                      | 40                    | 11                    | 504                | 650                         | .85                             |
| 1320                      | 11                    | 9                     | 174                | 235                         | .83                             |
| TOTAL                     | 63                    | 46                    | 1175               | 1475                        | .87                             |
| <br><u>1977</u><br>1100W  | <br>3                 | <br>1                 | <br>17             | <br>26                      | <br>.81                         |
| 1110                      | 11                    | 8                     | 193                | 267                         | .79                             |
| 1120                      | 2                     | 4                     | 92                 | 105                         | .93                             |
| 1310                      | 55                    | 8                     | 300                | 444                         | .82                             |
| 1320                      | 11                    | 3                     | 107                | 146                         | .83                             |
| TOTAL                     | 82                    | 24                    | 709                | 988                         | .82                             |



LIEUTENANT COMMANDER SELECTIONS

| <u>FY/<br/>DESIGNATOR</u> | <u>ABOVE<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>BELOW<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>IN<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>IN ZONE<br/>ELIGIBLE</u> | <u>SELECTION<br/>PROPORTION</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u>1976</u><br>1100W      | 1                     | 1                     | 13                 | 20                          | .75                             |
| 1110                      | 27                    | 16                    | 185                | 251                         | .91                             |
| 1120                      | 11                    | 9                     | 83                 | 95                          | 1.08                            |
| 1310                      | 21                    | 13                    | 292                | 484                         | .67                             |
| 1320                      | 4                     | 3                     | 83                 | 138                         | .65                             |
| TOTAL                     | 64                    | 42                    | 656                | 988                         | .77                             |
| <u>1975</u><br>1100W      | 1                     | 1                     | 4                  | 8                           | .75                             |
| 1110                      | 7                     | 16                    | 184                | 276                         | .75                             |
| 1120                      | 13                    | 10                    | 59                 | 87                          | .94                             |
| 1310                      | 9                     | 22                    | 226                | 342                         | .75                             |
| 1320                      | 6                     | 8                     | 68                 | 108                         | .76                             |
| TOTAL                     | 36                    | 57                    | 541                | 821                         | .77                             |
| <u>1974</u><br>1100W      | 0                     | 1                     | 4                  | 7                           | .71                             |
| 1110                      | 9                     | 26                    | 149                | 234                         | .79                             |
| 1120                      | 1                     | 14                    | 53                 | 85                          | .80                             |
| 1310                      | 10                    | 23                    | 191                | 299                         | .75                             |
| 1320                      | 8                     | 11                    | 92                 | 147                         | .76                             |
| TOTAL                     | 28                    | 75                    | 489                | 772                         | .77                             |
| <u>1973</u><br>1100W      | 1                     | 2                     | 12                 | 20                          | .75                             |
| 1110                      | 23                    | 21                    | 118                | 168                         | .96                             |
| 1120                      | 0                     | 7                     | 12                 | 15                          | 1.27                            |
| 1310                      | 3                     | 21                    | 126                | 173                         | .87                             |
| 1320                      | 3                     | 5                     | 101                | 169                         | .65                             |
| TOTAL                     | 30                    | 56                    | 369                | 545                         | .83                             |



COMMANDER SELECTIONS

| <u>FY/<br/>DESIGNATOR</u>   | <u>ABOVE<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>BELOW<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>IN<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>IN ZONE<br/>ELIGIBLE</u> | <u>SELECTION<br/>PROPORTION</u> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u>1979</u><br><u>1100W</u> | 0                     | 0                     | 10                 | 13                          | .77                             |
| 1110                        | 21                    | 7                     | 211                | 312                         | .77                             |
| 1120                        | 5                     | 3                     | 56                 | 71                          | .90                             |
| 1310                        | 20                    | 5                     | 162                | 278                         | .67                             |
| 1320                        | 8                     | 1                     | 81                 | 159                         | .57                             |
| TOTAL                       | 54                    | 16                    | 520                | 833                         | .71                             |
| <u>1978</u><br><u>1100W</u> | 3                     | 1                     | 12                 | 20                          | .80                             |
| 1110                        | 9                     | 10                    | 273                | 437                         | .67                             |
| 1120                        | 4                     | 6                     | 78                 | 99                          | .89                             |
| 1310                        | 6                     | 16                    | 190                | 286                         | .76                             |
| 1320                        | 1                     | 6                     | 74                 | 127                         | .65                             |
| TOTAL                       | 23                    | 39                    | 627                | 969                         | .71                             |
| <u>1977</u><br><u>1100W</u> | 0                     | 0                     | 4                  | 6                           | .67                             |
| 1110                        | 5                     | 12                    | 224                | 371                         | .65                             |
| 1120                        | 4                     | 7                     | 67                 | 94                          | .83                             |
| 1310                        | 6                     | 9                     | 159                | 211                         | .83                             |
| 1320                        | 0                     | 1                     | 51                 | 91                          | .57                             |
| TOTAL                       | 15                    | 29                    | 505                | 773                         | .71                             |
| <u>1976</u><br><u>1100W</u> | 2                     | 1                     | 10                 | 18                          | .72                             |
| 1110                        | 16                    | 10                    | 332                | 525                         | .68                             |
| 1120                        | 3                     | 5                     | 119                | 158                         | .80                             |
| 1310                        | 12                    | 7                     | 199                | 311                         | .70                             |
| 1320                        | 3                     | 1                     | 66                 | 97                          | .72                             |
| TOTAL                       | 36                    | 24                    | 726                | 1109                        | .71                             |





COMMANDER SELECTIONS

| <u>FY/<br/>DESIGNATOR</u> | <u>ABOVE<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>BELOW<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>IN<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>IN ZONE<br/>ELIGIBLE</u> | <u>SELECTION<br/>PROPORTION</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u>1975</u>               |                       |                       |                    |                             |                                 |
| 1100W                     | 0                     | 1                     | 5                  | 8                           | .75                             |
| 1110                      | 7                     | 21                    | 123                | 234                         | .65                             |
| 1120                      | 4                     | 16                    | 56                 | 77                          | .99                             |
| 1310                      | 7                     | 17                    | 104                | 180                         | .71                             |
| 1320                      | 2                     | 2                     | 10                 | 29                          | .48                             |
| TOTAL                     | 20                    | 57                    | 298                | 528                         | .71                             |
| <u>1974</u>               |                       |                       |                    |                             |                                 |
| 1100W                     | 1                     | 1                     | 11                 | 19                          | .68                             |
| 1110                      | 8                     | 14                    | 77                 | 138                         | .72                             |
| 1120                      | 2                     | 8                     | 22                 | 32                          | 1.00                            |
| 1310                      | 3                     | 18                    | 111                | 192                         | .69                             |
| 1320                      | 0                     | 2                     | 28                 | 51                          | .59                             |
| TOTAL                     | 14                    | 43                    | 249                | 432                         | .71                             |
| <u>1973</u>               |                       |                       |                    |                             |                                 |
| 1100W                     | 0                     | 1                     | 2                  | 4                           | .75                             |
| 1110                      | 0                     | 8                     | 62                 | 140                         | .50                             |
| 1120                      | 3                     | 5                     | 22                 | 31                          | .97                             |
| 1310                      | 15                    | 6                     | 67                 | 100                         | .88                             |
| 1320                      | 2                     | 2                     | 8                  | 12                          | 1.00                            |
| TOTAL                     | 20                    | 22                    | 161                | 287                         | .71                             |



CAPTAIN SELECTIONS

| <u>FY/<br/>DESIGNATOR</u> | <u>ABOVE<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>BELOW<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>IN<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>IN ZONE<br/>ELIGIBLE</u> | <u>SELECTION<br/>PROPORTION</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u>1979</u><br>1100W      | 0                     | 1                     | 2                  | 4                           | .75                             |
| 1110                      | 1                     | 14                    | 88                 | 189                         | .55                             |
| 1120                      | 1                     | 4                     | 62                 | 87                          | .77                             |
| 1310                      | 2                     | 6                     | 99                 | 181                         | .59                             |
| 1320                      | 0                     | 2                     | 8                  | 21                          | .48                             |
| TOTAL                     | 4                     | 27                    | 259                | 482                         | .60                             |
| <u>1978</u><br>1100W      | 2                     | 0                     | 3                  | 5                           | 1.00                            |
| 1110                      | 6                     | 9                     | 64                 | 149                         | .53                             |
| 1120                      | 1                     | 5                     | 11                 | 17                          | 1.00                            |
| 1310                      | 17                    | 11                    | 104                | 199                         | .66                             |
| 1320                      | 1                     | 1                     | 22                 | 52                          | .46                             |
| TOTAL                     | 27                    | 26                    | 204                | 422                         | .61                             |
| <u>1977</u><br>1100W      | 1                     | 0                     | 1                  | 3                           | .67                             |
| 1110                      | 8                     | 13                    | 58                 | 124                         | .64                             |
| 1120                      | 2                     | 4                     | 33                 | 47                          | .83                             |
| 1310                      | 11                    | 8                     | 136                | 278                         | .56                             |
| 1320                      | 1                     | 1                     | 12                 | 20                          | .70                             |
| TOTAL                     | 23                    | 26                    | 240                | 472                         | .61                             |
| <u>1976</u><br>1100W      | 1                     | 0                     | 1                  | 3                           | .67                             |
| 1110                      | 11                    | 15                    | 66                 | 137                         | .67                             |
| 1120                      | 11                    | 9                     | 48                 | 70                          | .97                             |
| 1310                      | 7                     | 16                    | 177                | 377                         | .53                             |
| 1320                      | 0                     | 1                     | 5                  | 10                          | .60                             |
| TOTAL                     | 30                    | 41                    | 297                | 597                         | .62                             |



CAPTAIN SELECTIONS

| <u>FY/<br/>DESIGNATOR</u> | <u>ABOVE<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>BELOW<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>IN<br/>ZONE</u> | <u>IN ZONE<br/>ELIGIBLE</u> | <u>SELECTION<br/>PROPORTION</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <u>1975</u><br>1100W      | 0                     | 1                     | 2                  | 5                           | .60                             |
| 1110                      | 12                    | 7                     | 74                 | 151                         | .62                             |
| 1120                      | 6                     | 7                     | 56                 | 83                          | .83                             |
| 1310                      | 6                     | 12                    | 136                | 284                         | .54                             |
| 1320                      | 0                     | 0                     | 0                  | 1                           | .00                             |
| TOTAL                     | 24                    | 27                    | 268                | 524                         | .61                             |
| <u>1974</u><br>1100W      | 0                     | 1                     | 6                  | 11                          | .64                             |
| 1110                      | 4                     | 13                    | 91                 | 187                         | .58                             |
| 1120                      | 4                     | 7                     | 44                 | 76                          | .72                             |
| 1310                      | 7                     | 15                    | 115                | 231                         | .59                             |
| 1320                      | 0                     | 1                     | 1                  | 5                           | .40                             |
| TOTAL                     | 15                    | 37                    | 257                | 510                         | .61                             |
| <u>1973</u><br>1100W      | 1                     | 0                     | 1                  | 3                           | .67                             |
| 1110                      | 17                    | 14                    | 85                 | 178                         | .65                             |
| 1120                      | 2                     | 13                    | 31                 | 51                          | .90                             |
| 1310                      | 12                    | 14                    | 86                 | 223                         | .50                             |
| 1320                      | 0                     | 0                     | 5                  | 8                           | .63                             |
| TOTAL                     | 32                    | 41                    | 208                | 463                         | .61                             |

Note 1: Selection proportions are defined by the sum of selectees above, below and in zone divided by the number of officers eligible in the zone. A proportion of greater than 1.00 is obtained when the number of all selectees is greater than the number of in zone eligibles.

Note 2: Data source: NAVOP 130 promotion files.



Note 3: These data include only the URL designators listed. It is important to note that other URL designators such as 1130 special warfare, USNR 1115 and 1315, etc. are not included. This is especially noteworthy as different data sources (e.g. "Navy Times"/NAVOP130) sometimes aggregate promotion data differently.





## APPENDIX E

PROMOTION P MEASURES BY OFFICER DESIGNATOR  
(FY 1974 to 1978, Selection to LCDR)

| <u>FY/<br/>DESIGNATOR</u> | <u>P<sub>1</sub></u> | <u>P<sub>2</sub></u> | <u>Line Fraction</u> |
|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <u>1978</u>               |                      |                      |                      |
| 1100W                     | .500                 | .874                 | .89                  |
| 1110                      | .450                 | .854                 | .89                  |
| 1120                      | .546                 | .909                 | .97                  |
| 1310                      | .442                 | .841                 | .85                  |
| 1320                      | .381                 | .820                 | .83                  |
| <u>1977</u>               |                      |                      |                      |
| 1100W                     | .296                 | .808                 | .81                  |
| 1110                      | .286                 | .774                 | .79                  |
| 1120                      | .358                 | .899                 | .93                  |
| 1310                      | .281                 | .771                 | .82                  |
| 1320                      | .276                 | .789                 | .83                  |
| <u>1976</u>               |                      |                      |                      |
| 1100W                     | .294                 | .747                 | .75                  |
| 1110                      | .364                 | .825                 | .91                  |
| 1120                      | .435                 | .930                 | 1.08                 |
| 1310                      | .308                 | .684                 | .67                  |
| 1320                      | .275                 | .648                 | .65                  |
| <u>1975</u>               |                      |                      |                      |
| 1100W                     | .188                 | .683                 | .75                  |
| 1110                      | .330                 | .713                 | .75                  |
| 1120                      | .366                 | .811                 | .94                  |
| 1310                      | .269                 | .703                 | .75                  |
| 1320                      | .265                 | .688                 | .76                  |



| <u>FY/<br/>DESIGNATOR</u> | <u>P<sub>1</sub></u> | <u>P<sub>2</sub></u> | <u>Line Fraction</u> |
|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <u>1974</u>               |                      |                      |                      |
| 1100W                     | .208                 | .619                 | .71                  |
| 1110                      | .314                 | .728                 | .79                  |
| 1120                      | .360                 | .784                 | .80                  |
| 1310                      | .315                 | .734                 | .75                  |
| 1320                      | .332                 | .700                 | .76                  |

Note 1: P<sub>1</sub> is defined as an estimation of the probability of promotion to LCDR in a given fiscal year for the set of officers who are either below-zone, or in-zone, or above-zone in that year. The following formula is used:

$$P_1 = \frac{\text{No. selected below-zone}}{\text{No. selected below-zone plus no. in-zone eligibles next year}} + \frac{\text{No. in zone selections}}{\text{No. in zone eligibles}} + \frac{\text{No. selected above-zone}}{\text{No. failed selection in-zone of prior year}}$$

$$P_1 = A + B + C$$

Note 2: P<sub>2</sub> is an estimation of the probability of a Lieutenant being selected either below-zone, or in-zone, or above-zone to the grade of Lieutenant Commander.  
From Note 1: P<sub>2</sub> = A + (1-A) (B) + (1-A) (1-B) (C)

Note 3: The P<sub>2</sub> measure can be improved 1) by using actual above and below-zone selection rates instead of the estimated rates based on the stated assumptions or 2) by basing the computations on the fiscal years an individual officer would progress through the below-zone, in-zone, and above-zone phases. This measure would then provide the individual with a more realistic appreciation of his overall promotion chances over the three year promotion process. It should be noted that the values of these different forms of P<sub>2</sub> are not a great deal different from the line fraction values.<sup>2</sup>

Note 4: Line fraction (selection proportion) taken from Appendix D.



## LIST OF REFERENCES AND SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. United States House of Representatives Report 95-566 Part 1, "Defense Officer Personnel Management Act", Committee on Armed Services, 4 August 1977.
2. Naval Military Personnel Center, Unrestricted Line Officer Career Guidebook, NAVPERS 15197A, NSN 0500-LP-272-9000, 1979.
3. Harms, J. H., "Navy Officer Promotion System - Past, Present, and Future", unpublished, 1975.
4. Center for Naval Analysis CNS 1096, An Evaluation of the Navy's URL Officer Accession Programs, by R. C. Kleinman, September 1977.
5. United States Code, Title Ten, Armed Forces, 1976 Edition. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
6. Martin, James K., "Officer Promotion Planning" Naval War College Review, September 1969, pp. 68-74.
7. McCormick, E.J. and Tiffin, J., Industrial Psychology, 6th Edition, Prentice-Hall, 1974.
8. President's Commission on Military Compensation, Report to the President, April 1978.
9. United States Navy Chief of Naval Operations, Historical Budget Data, 1978.
10. Lassiter, Ronald L., Some Correlates of Naval Promotional Viability, M.S. Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, 1975.
11. Burgess, John E., "Survival of the Fittest in Naval Aviation," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, pp. 43-49, October, 1971
12. Turkington, William W., "Survival of the Fittest: Five Years Later," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, pp. 59-65, October, 1976.



## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

13. Anderson, John F., Analysis of the Correlation Between Psychological Variables and U.S. Navy Officers Promotion, M.S. Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, 1976.
14. Carrick, Paul M., Some Economic Issues in Navy Manpower Administration, unpublished, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, 1978.
15. Center for Naval Analysis RC 249, CNA Officer Projection Model, Volume 1, Guide to Users, February, 1974.
16. Chief of Naval Operations, Officer Requirements Plan, Fiscal Years 1978-1982, 9 December 1977.
17. Rand Corporation Report R-1450-ARPA, Military Manpower and the All-Volunteer Force, by Richard V.L. Cooper, September 1977.
18. Defense Manpower Commission, Report to the President, Defense Manpower: The Keystone of National Security, 19 April 1976.





# INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

|                                                                                                                                                                                 | No. Copies |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 1. Defense Documentation Center<br>Cameron Station<br>Alexandria, Virginia 22314                                                                                                | 2          |
| 2. Library, Code 0142-<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, California 93940                                                                                               | 2          |
| 3. Department Chairman, Code 55 (Zo)<br>Department of Operations Research<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, California 93940                                            | 1          |
| 4. Prof. Richard S. Elster, Code 54 (Ea)<br>Department of Operations Research and<br>Administrative Sciences<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, California 93940         | 1          |
| 5. Associate Prof. Paul M. Carrick, Code 54 (Ca)<br>Department of Operations Research and<br>Administrative Sciences<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, California 93940 | 1          |
| 6. Assoc. Prof. Paul R. Milch, Code 55 (Mh)<br>Department of Operations Research and<br>Administrative Sciences<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, California 93940      | 1          |
| 7. Prof. James Arima, Code 54 (Aa)<br>Department of Operations Research and<br>Administrative Sciences<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, California 93940               | 1          |
| 8. CDR John Kelly<br>DCNO (MPT)<br>Code OP-136C<br>Washington, D.C. 20370                                                                                                       | 1          |
| 9. Dr. Kneale T. Marshall<br>Scientific Advisor to<br>DCNO (MPT)<br>Code OP-01T<br>Washington, D. C. 20370                                                                      | 1          |



10. LCDR David Peck 1  
DCNO (MPT)  
Code OP-130  
Washington, D.C. 20370
11. LCDR Ross Hansell 2  
DCNO (MPT)  
Code OP-134  
Washington, D.C. 20370
12. DCNO (MPT) 1  
Code OP-10  
Washington, D.C. 20370
13. DCNO (MPT) 1  
Code OP-11  
Washington, D.C. 20370
14. Dr. Robert Lockman 1  
Director, Manpower Studies Division  
Center for Naval Analyses  
1401 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22209
15. Commanding Officer 1  
Navy Personnel R & D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152
16. Dr. Bernard D. Rostker 1  
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary  
of the Navy (M&RA)  
OASN (MRA&L)  
Department of the Navy  
Washington, D.C. 20350













Thesis  
H1994  
c.1

Hansell  
Officer promotion  
opportunity within the  
Navy unrestricted line  
1973-1979.

12 OCT 97

58206

2

Thesis

182872

H1994 Hansell

c.1      Officer promotion  
         opportunity within  
         the Navy unrestricted  
         line 1973-1979.

thesH1994

Officer promotion opportunity within the



3 2768 002 07635 8

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY